NOTES ON THE 22ND ARTICLE

Class 236.5 P Book J495
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK C. 2

IN MEMORIAM
DEAN MILO HUDSON
GATES

SOLD BY
THOMAS BAKER,
72 Newman Street,

(PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED:)
PURGATORY, PARDONS,
INVOCATION OF SAINTS,
IMAGES, RELICS.

(PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED:) PURGATORY, PARDONS, INVOCATION OF SAINTS, IMAGES, RELICS.

SOME REMARKS AND NOTES ON THE TWENTY-SECOND ARTICLE OF RELIGION.

BY

THE REV. EUSTACE T. d'E. JESSE, M.A.,

SOMETIME RECTOR OF KIRKLEY-ON-SEA, SUFFOLK.

LONDON:

SKEFFINGTON & SON, PICCADILLY, W.

PUBLISHERS TO H.M. THE QUEEN AND TO H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES.

1900.

105657
236.5P
J495
C.2

NEW YORK
LIBRARY
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MADE AND PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN.

Contents.

PAGE

PREFACE ... ... xv.

EXCERPTA ... ... xvii.

CHAPTER I.—INTRODUCTORY 1

The Ten Articles of 1536 : Archbishop Bramhall on the "Articles of Religion" : Judge Stowell ; the Augsburg Confession ; Melancthon, Luther, Bossuet, the "Thirteen Articles" of 1539 ; the Papal Bull "Regnans in Excelsis" ; the Articles not "Protestant" in the modern sense ; Council of Trent, "a carpet bag" ; "Dogmatic Position of the Church of England."

CHAPTER II. *(Introductory to Chapter III.)*—PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED 11

Divisions of the Articles, Sub-divisions of Article XXII., Articles of 1553, 1563, 1571. The "*School-authors.*" S. Vincent of Lerins, "the Primitive Church," and I. Edward VI. c. i. 7.

Prayers for the Departed and the Intermediate State, Cranmer on "continuity." Early Liturgies appealed to : Liturgy of S. James, of S. Mark, of S. John Chrysostom, of S. Cyril (Coptic), of S. Basil, of Rome, of Mâr Adäi and of Mâr Mâri (Assyrian), of Mâr Theodorus, of Mâr Nestorius ; reference to the Armenian Church, William Palmer on Liturgies, Gallican Offices, Gothico-Gallican Missal ; Hart's "Ecclesiastical Records."

Appeal to Keltic Monuments, the "Book of Durrow." Edmund Burke, "Ritualistic conspiracy" ; Canon of 1571

CHAPTER II. *(continued).* PAGE

(Note, Canon Bright on the Fathers), of 1603. Pan-Anglican Synod of 1867.

Appeals to Early Fathers: Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Irenæus, S. Chrysostom, Lactantius, S. Hilary, S. Augustine, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Ambrose (Note on the Benedictine Fathers), Gregory Nazianzen, Philaret. Objection by the heretic Arius, the Hypno-psychites.

Appeal to Reformation Period and to our own times. The English Primer of 1545. Archbishop Cranmer and "The Institution of a Christian Man," or the "Bishops' Book" of 1537. "The King's Book" of 1543 (*see Corrigenda*), Injunctions of Edward VI., the "Liber Precum." Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 referred to. Act of Uniformity of 1549. Wheatly, Bishop Cosin, Horsley, Froude, the Primer of 1559, Bishop Andrewes, Archbishop Usher, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Bidding Prayer" of Irish Church Convocation of 1662 and 1665. Bishop Ken, Thorndyke, Bishop Bull, Bishop Butler, Mr. Gladstone, Dr. Wellon, Joseph Mede, Bishop Overall, Bishop Wilson, Bishop Heber, Dr. Johnson, Bingham, Bishop Shute Barrington, Dr. Neale, Dr. Pusey, Bishop Harold Browne, Dean Plumptre, the Burial Service and Dr. J. H. Blunt, Canon Wilberforce, Canon Liddon, Dean Luckock.

Monumental evidence; tombs of Bishop Cosin and Bishop Barrow.

Appeal to other writers and divines: Bishop Forbes of Brechin, Dean Farrar, S. Clement of Rome referred to, Bishop Magee, Lord Shaftesbury.

Lawsuit, Case of Breeks *v.* Woolfrey.

John Wesley, Richard Baxter the Puritan, Luther, the Lutheran Dr. Martensen, Dr. Newman, Cardinal Perrone and Protestants, Leibnitz. Remarks on Eccles. xi. 3. Bishop Christopher Wordsworth: the Movement in the Scotch Establishment. Dean Luckock's "The Divine Liturgy." Jewish Prayers for the Departed: Funeral of Prince Henry of Battenburg, "The English Churchman's" remarks theron. Service at S. Paul's and a Russian prayer. The Bishop of Rochester on Prayers for the Departed, also Archbishop Temple.

References to the Eastern Catholic, or "Orthodox" Churches, and to Mr. Khomiakoff: Luckock on "The Beatific Vision"; opinions expressed at the Bonn Conference.

PAGE

CHAPTER III.—CONCERNING PURGATORY 82

The Council of Trent, Father Sarpi thereon. An Anglican Divine on Purgatory and the primary intention of Prayers for the Departed: the "Doctrina Romanensium," why Article XXII. is not a reply to the Council, "Romanenses," "the Romish Doctrine" of Purgatory: Decree of the Council of Trent; Council of Florence, Creed of Pius V. Wording of Tridentine Canon and of the Catechism contrasted. "the fire that shall try every man's work," S. Hilary and others on these words; Gregory the Great's move, Dr. Pusey, "Church Quarterly Review," S. Justin Martyr.

The "pious opinions" of certain Fathers, "justified souls in torments," Di Bruno's misstatements in his "Catholic Belief," so-called, and Dr. Littledale's remarks thereon, S. Augustine, opinions of the Greek Catholic and Russian Catholic Churches, S. Thomas Aquinas.

Council of Florence, the Greeks at the Council of Basel, Origen: the reply of the Greek Church to Leo XIII., and her "Orthodox Confession," in which the "Romish Doctrine" is repudiated; the Bonn Conference. The Roman Liturgy contradicts the Romish Doctrine, Cardinal Newman on Purgatory, a topographical guide to Purgatory: S. Francesca Romana and S. Maria Magdalena of Pazzi. Cardinal Bellarmine on Punishment and Divine Justice. Bishop Forbes (of Brechin), Archer Butler, Council of Trent remarks on Justification and Sanctification. Homily of S. John Chrysostom on Grace and Remission (Note on Father Paul Sarpi).

A book too little read, written by Macaire, Bishop of Vinnitza, wherein he strongly opposes the Romish Doctrine. S. Catherine of Genoa, a new and more gentle opinion of Purgatory: "Church Quarterly Review" on S. Catherine. Canon MacColl quoted: "Hell," Hades," "Gehenna." (Note, representation at General Councils.)

CHAPTER IV.—CONCERNING PARDONS OR INDULGENCES 130

The Tridentine Council, again professes to follow "ancient traditions of the Fathers," Cardinal Fisher's trenchant remark on the Origin of Purgatory à la Romaine, Durandus is uncertain, S. Antoninus of Florence, Cardinal Cajetan: our Ten Articles of 1536.

CHAPTER IV. *(continued)*. PAGE

The origin and growth of Indulgences; "convicted of notorious sin," the Emperor Theodosius, Canon 74 of S. Basil, Amort on Indulgences, "the ancient notion of an Indulgence" as given by Bingham. The Conservative Greek Church admits Indulgences in this life only; so do we: Mayence Council speaks of "a custom most dangerous to many." SS. Richard and Hugo of S. Victor, their "advanced" teaching: Peter Lombard urges further. Bishop Harold Browne: quotation from Wilkin's "Concilia": strong protest by Council of Cloveshoo concerning commutation of penance in return for "cash."

Influence of the Crusades increases sale of Indulgences, Dr. Von Döllinger quoted, cash and a tough-skinned "middleman," the market price. Gibbon. John XXII. claims prerogatives, but declines to depopulate Purgatory. Dr Pusey quoted, Sir Thomas More.

The arguments of the Schoolmen: the treasury of superabundant merits, and acts of supererogation: Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, S. Thomas Aquinas: Declaration of Clement VI. Bouvier, author of "Traité des Indulgences": Dean Hook's "Church Dictionary." Connection between Article XXII. and Article XIV.: Cardinal Perrone, "good marks," bank-book of the Saints, credit side; (Note, the Anglican Church and her protest at the Council of Basel); Gregory VII., in his contest against Henry IV. of Germany, starts distorted views of Indulgences; Gabriel Biel: the Oratorian Morinus.

Innocent III. and Fourth Lateran Council: Boniface VIII. and the Jubilee, "opened Heaven by a short and more convenient method"; Clement VI. gives a "pass" to Paradise. Thomas Gascoigne, Eugenius IV. and "Master Peter de Monte": the market value of Indulgences drops. Protests against Indulgences by Archbishop Neville, Archbishop Sudbury, Archbishop Courteney, by the University of Oxford, in 1414.

Side remarks on rival Popes and certain Councils: Chaucer sarcastic: protest from the Synod of Exeter; 28,000 years' delivery from Purgatory, also of 555,293 years. John Tetzel and Co., Fabroni's remarks. Complaint of the Princes of Nuremburg: Cardinal Cajetan: money an equivalent for a certain amount of satisfaction *ex opere operato*. Lingard, "an intolerable impudence." Roman Bishops who prohibited

CHAPTER IV. *(continued).* PAGE

reception of Papal Indulgences within their dioceses. Warning preached at Council of Trent (Note, the Pope or the Emperor "an ass," both "thieves"). Story humorous and sarcastic withal. "Plenary Indulgences." S. Lutgard's terrible vision of a holy Pope in flames. The Abbé Louvet and Purgatory. The "Scapular," what it is, its virtues; the "Sabbatine Bull" a forgery. The vision of S. Simon Stock: Scapularies fell from Heaven.

Father Sarpi, "Lectures on Mediæval Church History" by Archbishop Trench. The Russian Priest, Wladimir Guettée, his work "Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique Orthodoxe," treats of Confession, Indulgences, etc. The Bonn Conference, Bishop Reinkens, Dr. Von Döllinger, and others thereat: Bishop Makary on Indulgences.

Notes on Chapter IV. "The Sacrifices of Masses," "blasphema figmenta," "in which it was commonly said," "The Mass." Father Puller's letter to "The Guardian." Bishop Gardiner on "a new redemption," "propitiatory," remarks made by the Spanish Jesuit Velasquez.

CHAPTER V.—CONCERNING INVOCATION OF SAINTS 181

The wording of the Council of Trent not objectionable in the matter of Masses in honour of the Saints. "Catechism of the Council of Trent," Questions 8, 10, 12; 8 and 12 not to be objected to by us. Questions 13 and 14; Heb. iv. 16. The Blessed Virgin Mary is "The Throne of Grace." "Invocation," "Comprecation."

Invocation considered under three heads. Services and tombs in the Catacombs (Note on the "Capitularies"), Commemoration of Martyrs, primitive; Eusebius and Polycarp. Exaggerated powers attributed to Saints, Tertullian protests: miracles claimed for them; employment of inflated language and Oriental phraseology: Cyril of Alexandria and Proclus; "The Paradise of the Second Adam"; Synod of Laodicæa against improperly worshipping angels; also Theodoret.

The Nestorian heresy (see *Addenda*). Of the titles "Theotokos" and "Deipara." "Theotokos" used in Greek Office Books. Theological importance of the title shown by Canon Bright (see *Corrigenda*). The Russian "Longer Catechism" thereon. The Pelagian heresy. The dogma of the "Immacu-

CHAPTER V. *(continued).* PAGE

late Conception" of the Blessed Virgin, Dominicans *versus* Franciscans, Father Sarpi. The Eutychian heresy: "Eve the Advocate": Archbishop Usher, Dean Luckock on Patristic evidence for Invocation. Ephraim Syrus, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S Epiphanius: Collyridian heretics and the title "Queen of Heaven." The "Ave Maria" in Liturgies of S. Mark and S. James; used as a *prayer* about 1200, in England about 1237; as an Antiphon in the Sacramentary of Gregory. Mr Simmons and his "Lay Folks' Masse Book," "Institutions of a Christian Man."

Moderate language of Tridentine language. Concerning Angels: Guardian Angels may be invoked; S. Ambrose, Père Maurel, Dr. Pusey, Bishop Bickersteth of Exeter, Bishop Moberly: "Comprecation," Canon Body, Invocation of Saints, Martin Luther and Spalatinus, Bishop Latimer, Bishop Morton, Thorndyke, Strype's "Ecclesiastical Memorials." The Puritan Richard Baxter bids us "look much to the departed Saints": the Protestant Princes, a Lutheran Abbot accepts the principle of Invocation: the Revisors of our Articles; Gaume and his "Catéchisme de Persevérance"; S. Victor on Invocation.

Difficulty connected with the terms "worship," "adoration," "proskunesis." Second Council of Nicæa, S. Gregory Nazianzen and Cardinal Bellarmine, their use of the words. The Mayor of a town addressed as "Your Worship," "worship" in the Paston letters. "Adoration" and "Reverence" in the Coronation Service: Papal election by "adoration." Bishop Ridley on "adoramus" and "worship": Mr. Ruskin's use of "worship," Dr. J. H. Blunt's Dictionary, "Latreia, latria." S. Augustine, Bossuet, quoted. Moëller on the use of "hyperdoulia," S. Thomas Aquinas added this word. Modern "proto-doulia" for S. Joseph (Note about S. Thomas); the "Church Times" quoted: Mr. Birkbeck's "Russia and the English Church," his footnote on "Service"; Mr. Khomiakoff's Essay, The "Longer Catechism": S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Basil. Mohler's "Symbolism," etc., S. Augustine.

Absurd "stories," Dr. Von Döllinger, "revelations," so-called, Santiago of Compostella. The Rev. Joseph Berrington on "vulgar reports," he accuses Roman ecclesiastical leaders of intentionally promoting ignorance and superstition (Note on the "Centuries" of Magdeburg); "The Garland of Mary";

CHAPTER V. *(continued).* PAGE

astounding extravagances of S. Alphonso Liguori, also of others; "The Rambler" (Note on the canonization of Saints), words taken from "The Office of the Sacred Heart," the Blessed Virgin "the universal dispenser of all graces."

Dogma of the Immaculate Conception again referred to. Dr. Pusey on the Mediatrix; "God is just, but Mary merciful": quotation from "The Exercise of Faith."

Impressions received by the author in France: examples of the Virgin prayed to more than to our Lord, she is also thanked more than our Lord. Cardinal Manning's "striking expression." Dr. Pusey on the cultus of the Virgin.

Gregory XVI. on the powers of the Blessed Virgin Mary: Pius IX., "Tracts for the Times" quoted; Dr. Doyle's evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons, Gother. Catechism of the Council again quoted. Archbishop De Dominis, the "Church Quarterly" and the "Catholic Times." Experience of the author in the South of France: the High Altar and that of the Virgin, relative value of Shrines.

Concerning other Saints: S. Clare for sore eyes, and others. Cardinal Perrone and Casaubon. Realistic and very vulgar form of address to the Virgin.

Remark by Guettée, Russian Catholic Priest, on false doctrine. The "Saints now in Heaven," Bishop Makary on this teaching: Bonn, Conference on "Invocation": Bishop Hall quoted: Bishop Forbes on the Twenty-second Article: Catechism of Council of Trent quoted: Bishop Makary again quoted.

Notes. The English Primer and "Ave Maria," "The Angelus." Concerning the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception" of the Blessed Virgin Mary: writers thereon quoted; Professor Cyriacus on Invocation: the Book of Common Prayer and Saints' Festivals and Commemorations; Bishops Pearson, Andrewes, and Jolly; remarks on our duty to the Blessed Virgin. Title "Son of Mary" objected to by "born idiots"; A. K. H. B.; Paul Sarpi quoted, the Blessed Virgin's total exemption from sin an "invented novelty." S. Anne, Archbishop Whately: "Devotion" to the Blessed Virgin Mary, Tillemont's remarks thereon; Dr. Littledale.

CHAPTER VI.—CONCERNING IMAGES 277

Distinction between "eidōlon" and "eikon." Objections to Images natural in the first age of the Church: first

CHAPTER VI. *(continued).* PAGE

Images symbolic of our Lord: Epistle of S. Basil to Julian. Council of Elvira against use of Images, Serenus opposed to it. Council of "In Trullis," its Eighty-second Canon quoted. Image Controversy in Byzantine Empire; Iconduli or Iconolatræ against Iconomachi or Iconoclastæ. Synod of Constantinople, the "Seventh General Council," Council of Gentilly (767), Pope and Irene; "obeissance," "aspasmes": this Council quoted as authoritative by Council of Trent; condemnation by the "Seventh General Council" of Pope Honorius as a heretic, awkward fact (see *Addenda*), the **"triumph of Orthodoxy."**

Charles the Great, the "Caroline Books": Council of Frankfort-on-the-Main protests against Second Council of Nicæa, a possible misunderstanding. Keble quoted. Louis the Pious and Council of Paris (824-5): other Councils.

Another Byzantine quarrel about Images; the advice of Gregory the Great, Robertson's History referred to. Thorwalsden, Gregory's Thirteenth Epistle and good counsel, Dr. Pusey's summing up. Remarks on the wording of Tridentine orders: Catechism of Council of Trent worded differently: Cardinal Bellarmine gives three current opinions as to "worship of Images." Dr. Milner, Petavius, "adiaphora." Bonaventura, are his words to be taken literally? Bishop **Naclantius at Trent, "for caution's sake."**

The author's impressions inside Chartres Cathedral, the "Black Virgin" there. "Il Bambino," the celebrated ridiculous story thereof, Lucinda, the "Benediction of the Bambino." Blaise Paschal, his remark. Peter Lombard and S. Thomas Aquinas; "due worship"; Father Paul Sarpi. The Cross to be worshipped with "*supreme worship*". S. Ambrose on the "True Cross" and S. Helena. Consavet on the careful choice of words in the Decrees of Tridentine **Council.**

Miraculous Crucifixes. The Eastern use of Icons, use of Incense in connection therewith; "Six months in a Syrian Monastery." The Cross on our Churches. S. Paul's. Crucifix used by Lutheran Protestants. Bishop Grindal.

Webb's "Sketches of Continental Ecclesiology"; the author's experience in Germany; works and pictures of Lutheran buildings and ceremonial. Sir Robert Phillimore's "Ecclesiastical Judgments," Mr. Beresford Hope. Dr. Arnold on the Crucifix and the Second Commandment, the Earl of

CHAPTER VI. *(continued).* PAGE

Shaftesbury and his Crucifix. The "Rood Screen": Images in 1536 and 1538; destruction in Queen Elizabeth's reign, she had a Crucifix in her Chapel: Visitation in 1559; a "pious fraud" exposed.

"Life of Parker," "Burnet's Reformation," "a common poster," trial in 1684, William Tindale and Sir Thomas More, Bishop Latimer. Argument of James I. Exeter Reredos Case, Boyd and others against Phillpotts, Bishop Latimer, Archbishop Cranmer, "Institutions of a Christian Man." Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Archbishop Tenison: the Judge's opinion on Homilies and Images in the Exeter Case. Strype on the "Book of the Festival," story in "Diary of a late Physician": good effect produced by the sight of outward things: story from South Africa: German Protestants do not reject Images of Christ and of the Saints: Reredos in S. Paul's: author does not care for a Crucifix on Altar or Re-table, triptychs desirable, triptychs in Southern Germany, etc. (see *Corrigenda*): Dutch traders and Irish Orangemen: the three Crosses in the "Union Jack," superfluity of Crosses; Crucifixion represented in a Protestant Chapel.

The Russian "Longer Catechism" on the Second Commandment, the Metropolitan Platon, Mouravieff's History quoted, a remark on "Icon."

Notes on Chapter VI. Some sixteenth century Images. Letter from Louis the Pious to the Emperor Michael II., Jortin quoted, horrible abuse in use of Images; Dean Milman, his "History of Latin Christianity" quoted. Ruskin's remarks on debased puppets: Images and Pictures of real art do not tend to idolatry, "Stones of Venice" quoted.

Explanation given to the author by an Italian Professor. Ruskin on the awe-inspiring influence of art; Parma, Florence, Venice, Pisa.

The "Contemporary Review" quoted. Figures in Lichfield Cathedral, Archbishop Maclagan's preachment thereon, the "Church Times" quoted. Apparent connection between the "Worship of the Sacred Heart" and Nestorianism.

CHAPTER VII.—CONCERNING RELICS 349

Bishop Forbes on the Twenty-second Article and Relics. Tridentine Council: real value of and power in Relics, "Ieipsana," Relics always venerated in S. Paul's and at

CHAPTER VII. *(continued).* PAGE

Greenwich: of S. Francis of Assisi: Cathedral of Milan and the author's impressions, S. Charles Borromeo; old letters and broken toys.

"Relics" and "Relics" Eusebius and Plato, Theodoret, the "Apostolic Constitutions," "more than gold," S. Ignatius Early Fathers not always in accord, S. Augustine, Spanheim quoted Rodolphus, Theodosius I., Council of Saragossa, its Second Canon; Second Council of Nicæa, Vatican Council; forgeries, falsities, fictions, ecclesiastical housebreakers; Milman. Letter to Pepin from S. Peter in Heaven. Mabillon, his inventory of Relics in S. Riquier, Robertson quoted "Stations of the Cross" useful, but the legend of S. Veronica to be eliminated, origin of the legend.

Our Lord's Winding-Sheet multiplicated, the "suaire"; Charles V. and an honest Bishop. The author visits Trier (Trèves), sees the "Holy Coat," agreeable impressions, and the contrary.

S. John the Baptist, three hands, ten forefingers Sarcasm of the Abbé Marolles on seeing a sixth head of S. John; other Relics of this Saint Frederick III., his collection of Relics; extensive catalogue of Relics at Hallé, able to afford Indulgences for 39,000,000 years: interesting collection at Glastonbury; Chaucer on Relics, "*Radix malorum est cupiditas*"

Dean Milman's sympathetic remarks on Memorials, Cardinal Newman on Relics: Jean Ferrand says, "*Providence multiplies Relics*" Dens on worshipping Relics.

The "Church Quarterly Review" and Father Ryder False "Relics" promote Atheism, and harm the Church and her religion.

(Note. Our own divisions and a possible cause, in part.)

CORRIGENDA 371

ADDENDA 373

Preface.

The writer gives three reasons—perhaps it were better to say *causes*—for the publishing of this volume.

1. The wide area covered by the Twenty-second Article, containing, as it does, at least six fields of subject whereon battle may be waged.
2. The fact that, as far as he is aware, no single volume exists treating of this Article alone.
3. That three of the subjects herein treated form the excuse for discussion and strife at the present time.

This volume is not an "*opus*"; it mainly consists of quotations relating to facts and documents, to expressions of other people's ideas. The writer does not claim to be an "author," even though he may use this term, considering himself to be but a compiler, a purveyor of other men's wares, a mere retailer of home and foreign mental produce.

The old advice, "Verify your quotations," is excellent, but it is impossible to carry it out under all conditions, and amid every surrounding.

Recognizing the existence of many imperfections in this volume, the writer hopes notwithstanding that the contents may prove useful to some "apprentices in theology" who, wishing to study this Twenty-second Article and certain present conflicts, may lack time and opportunity for seeking and finding so many and varied materials in the extensive quarries of history, which a greater leisure, not a more ample or superior sagacity, enables him to lay before his readers.

Marsala, Sicily, 1899.

Excerpta.

"The Bible is perfect, and sufficient of itself for the Truth of the Catholic Faith, and the whole Church cannot make one Article of Faith (though it may be taken as a necessary witness of the same) without these three conditions:—that the thing which we establish thereby hath been believed in all places, always, and by all the faithful"—"ubique, semper, ab omnibus" (S. Vincent of Lerins).

"In the Catholic Church itself, also, great care is to be taken that we hold that which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all; for that is truly and properly Catholic, as the very meaning and derivation of the word show, which embraces all, as nearly as may be, universally. This we shall only then do when we follow Universality, Antiquity, Consent."

"Idcirco multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut propheticæ, et apostolicæ interpretationis linea secundum ecclesiastici et Catholici sensus normam dirigatur" (Cap. XI.).

"In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est ud id teneamus, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est:* hoc est etenim vere proprieque Catholicum. Hoc ita demum fit si sequamur *universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem* (omnium vel certe pœne omnium) sacerdotum pariter et magistrorum" (Cap. III.).

"Imitetur animarum ratio rationem corporum, quæ licet

annorum processu numeros suos evolvent et explicent, eadem tamen, quæ erant permanent" (Cap. XXIX.). (From the "Commonitorium pro Catholicæ Ecclesiæ fidei antiquitate et universalitate adversus profanas omnium hæreticorum veritates," written A.D. 434 by S. Vincent of Lerins in Gaul. The oldest edition of this work is, we believe, that published at Basle in 1528.)

"It is Vincentius Lirinensis' great rule of faith, 'Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus,' and he that goes against 'what is said always, and everywhere, and by all Christians,' had need have a new revelation or an infallible spirit, or he hath an intolerable pride and foolishness of presumption. Out of the Communion of the Universal Church no man can be saved. They are the Body of Christ, and the whole Church cannot perish, and Christ cannot be a Head without a Body; and He will be for ever our Redeemer, and for ever intercede for His Church, and be glorious in His Saints; and he that does not sow in these furrows, but leaves the way of the whole Church, hath no pretence for his error, no excuse for his pride, and will find no alleviation of his punishment" (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Sermon on the Minister's Duty, etc.).

"What is matter of Faith must be capable of being proved out of Holy Scripture, yet, that not according to the private sense of individuals, but according to the uniform teaching of the Church" (Dr. Pusey's "Rule of Faith").

"We commend the medium between extremes, and say it it is right to follow it" (Aristotle, "Polit.," VIII. 3).

"As for my religion, I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Faith, professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly, I die in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands dis-

tinguished from all *Papal* and *Puritan* innovations, and as it adheres to the Doctrine of the Cross" (From the Will of Bishop Ken, of Wells, died March 19th, 1710).

"The Church is not a school of philosophy where every man may utter the imaginations of his mind" (Bishop Thomas Wilson's "Maxims").

"The Anglican Church 'distinctly recognizes the power of Councils, and the authority of the Fathers'" (see Bishop Andrewes' Reply to Cardinal Perrone).

"The Law of the Church of England is derived from the leading general Councils of the undivided Church, from the practice and usage incorporating portions of the general canonical jurisprudence, from provincial constitutions, from canons passed by her clergy and confirmed by the Crown in Convocation, and from statutes enacted by Parliament—that is, the Crown, the spirituality, and the temporality of the realm" ("The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England," by the late Sir Robert Phillimore, Bart., 1895).

"There was a very trying interval for the Church of England in the sixteenth century, when it ran great risk of being wrecked; but it weathered the storm, and its good fortune may be regarded as a Providence, and become a positive argument for its being what its great history betokens it" (Dr. Newman).

"In the first place, let preachers take care that they never teach anything in the way of preaching which they wish to be retained religiously or believed by the people except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, *and what the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected from that same doctrine*" (From the Canons of 1571, passed by the same Convocation that accepted the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion when finally

subscribed to). In the original Latin: "In primis *videbunt Concionatores, nequid unquam doceant pro concione quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit* doctrinæ veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina *Catholici Patres* et *veteres Episcopi* collegerint" (Canon of 1571, called by Bishop Cosin "the golden rule of the Church of England").

"Have done with the morbid restlessness of the present day; shun all attempts at novelty; enquire what was from the *beginning*, consult the *sources*, have recourse to *antiquity*, go back to the *Fathers*, look to the *Primitive Church*" (John Pearson's "Concio ad Clerum"; opera Minora, Ed. Churton, II. 6).

On interpretation of Scripture, Bishop Stillingfleet wrote: "Where the sense appears doubtful, and disputes appear doubtful about it, *inquire into the sense of the Christian Church in the first ages, as the best interpreter of Scripture . . . many . . . questions of great importance receive great light from the writings of the first ages*" (From his Charge given at Worcester, A.D. 1690; see "Ecclesiastical Cases," 8vo, London, 1690).

"As a matter of fact, the Articles appear to have been intended not as definite solutions, but rather as 'Articles of peace,' they aim at shelving rather than defining questions. . . . The moment—at the period of the Reformation—was one of transition and movement. It is very untrue to call it a moment of settlement. This is apparent in retrospect. What has become of definite Calvinism and definite Lutheranism all over Europe? Has Rome stopped at the Tridentine position? Had the sixteenth century the materials at its disposal which are necessary for understanding the early history of Christian doctrine? However unsatisfactory then the Articles are positively as statements of truth, they are

satisfactory in what they are not. It is the very fact that the Church of England at the Reformation did not commit herself to any one of the three then dominant tendencies which leaves us now at the present moment in a unique position of hopefulness among the Churches of Europe. We are left standing firm on the Creeds, the Sacraments, the Apostolic succession of her ministry, and on that basis we are to rise, with the help of the clearer knowledge we now have, to the full apprehension and presentation of the ancient Faith" ("The Mission of the Church," by Charles Gore, Canon of Westminster).

In the Lambeth Conference of 1888, the Report of the Committee on Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship makes the following statement:—

"With regard to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, we thank God for the wisdom which guided our fathers, in difficult times, in framing statements of doctrine, for the most part accurate in their language and reserved and moderate in their definitions. Even when speaking most strongly and under the pressure of great provocation, our Communion has generally refrained from anathemas upon opponents, and we desire in this to follow those who have preceded us in the Faith. The omission of a few clauses in a few of the Articles would render the whole body free from any imputation of injustice or harshness towards those who differ from us. At the same time, we feel that all the Articles are not of equal value, that they are not, and do not profess to be, a complete statement of Christian doctrine, and that, from the temporary and local circumstances under which they were composed, they do not always meet the requirements founded under totally different conditions" (p. 110).

"Can they teach that the judgment of the Bishop of Rome is superior to God's judgment? . . . I steadfastly affirm that if the Bishop of Rome sin against his brethren, and, though often admonished, do not hear the Church, he, the Bishop of Rome, I say, is by God's command to be held as a heathen man and a publican. For the higher is the rank the graver is the fall. But if he think us unworthy of his Communion for this reason, that none of us will consent to believe contrary to the Gospel, he cannot on that ground separate us from the Communion of Christ" (Gerbert, Pope Sylvester II., A.D. 1003, to Segwin, Archbishop of Sens; copied from Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons," etc.).

"Upon the *spurious decretals* was built the great fabric of Papal supremacy over the different national Churches, a fabric which has stood after its foundation crumbled beneath it, for no one has pretended to deny, during the last two centuries, that the imposture is too palpable for any but the most ignorant to deny" (Hallam's "Middle Ages," Vol. II., Chap. VII.).

"I also admit Holy Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; *neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers*" (Third Clause of the Tridentine Confession of Faith, professed by all the clergy under the Roman Obedience).

"During nine centuries of the seven General Councils the Eastern Orthodox Church never recognized the Papal supremacy. The great Basil, and Photius, Hierarch of Constantinople, opposed it. Pope Nicholas I. made the

first move towards the schism. The germs of Popery (τὸν παπισμὸν) were found in pseudo-Clementines, which were further supported by the false decretals, which are a tissue of forgeries.

"Yet, knowing that they were forgeries, the Papal Church still taught this supremacy of the Roman See, to the consternation of the Christian world. But S. Peter—whose successor the Pope claims to be—thrice denied Christ. Liberius Arianized, Vigilius was declared heterodox by a Synod, Honorius was condemned as a Monothelite heretic by a General Council, and by many succeeding Popes.

"In vain, therefore, does the Pope refer us to *antiquity* to find out what our forefathers believed, for we know that in their days none of these novelties had any existence" (From the reply of the Greek Catholic Church to the Encyclical of Leo XIII., Bishop of Rome, and signed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anthinus, and by twelve other Bishops, in the Patriarch's palace in Constantinople, August, 1895).

"The Anglican Church alone of the Protestant * Communions—which have rejected both Fathers and Synods, and Sacraments and Hierarchy, and, in short, all Ecclesiastical Tradition—the Anglican Church alone, I say, after a long and terrible struggle, has been able, so far as circumstances permitted, to preserve from the deluge of innovation

* "Protestant," *i.e.*, of those Communions which rejected undue Papal claims and Romish accretions. Many Easterns still use the term "Protestant" in its primary, *i.e.*, historical sense, which did not signify that system of negations which Dissenters now call "the Protestant Faith." Just before the landing of William of Orange, the Lower House of Convocation refused to sanction the title "the Protestant Church." But at an earlier period the term was used in a different sense, as when Archbishop Laud said, "I die a Protestant." The reader is referred to "Theophilus Anglicanus," by the late Christopher Wordsworth, Lord Bishop of Lincoln.

(μεταρρυθμίσεως) a portion of Orthodox Truth, as having accepted the power of Synods, the authority of Fathers, in part at least, and an Episcopal Hierarchy" (From "The Voice of Orthodoxy," by Gregory, Metropolitan of Chios, 1861).

The wording of the Western Creed which we use might make the Metropolitan deny us (and the Church of Rome) a fulness of orthodox truth. We mean as to the Procession of the Holy Ghost. We say, "Proceeding from the Father *and* the Son"; the Easterns say, "From the Father *through* the Son."

"But the crowning point of our sympathy with Christ-loving England is her calm and gradual recurrence, in matters of religion, to the pure traditionary principles and teaching anterior to the great and lamentable schism of arrogant and most despotic Rome" (From a Sermon by Cleobulus, Metropolitan of Cæsareia of Cappadocia, preached April 29th, 1872, in the "Church of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary," at Pera, Constantinople).

"The present adherents of the Church of Rome are not, in my judgment, Catholics. We are the Catholics. We can prove that we hold the doctrines of the Primitive Church for the first three hundred years. The Council of Trent made the Papists what they are" ("Table Talk," by Samuel Taylor Coleridge; died 1834).

"Tu es ergo inquit, Petrus dictus a petra quam confessus es, quam cognovisti dicens: tu es Christus filius Dei, et supra hanc Petram, *id est super Me ipsum filium* Dei, non super te ædificabo ecclesiam meam; *super Me* ædificabo te et alios, non me super te, non enim dicuntur esse Petri, sed Christi, non a Petro Petrini, sed a Christo Christiani, ne *esset spes in homine*, maledictus enim, qui spem suam ponit in homine."—*Peter Lombard.*

CHAPTER I.

Introductory.

WE possess distinct affirmations and authoritative statements that the Thirty-nine Articles were not framed, constituted, and published for the purpose of causing divisions, but, like the Ten Articles of 1536, to avoid differences of opinion as far as consistency with Catholic truth would permit "to stablish Christian quietness and unity." The intention of those who framed them was to be truly liberal without that inexcusable vagueness which certain in the present day appear to consider the essential being of liberality. Like the ancient School of Alexandria, our Reforming forefathers, with similar large-heartedness, strove to perceive and to gather the best in and from everything.

The Thirty-nine Articles differ in intensity. Though called "Articles of Religion," some are Articles of Faith likewise, *e.g.*, the first five, not founded on the Augsburg Confession of 1530, but on the ancient Creeds of Christendom, and which all Orthodox Christians must accept. Certain others possess only local reference, or are merely of temporary interest or import, and may disappear.

Thus wrote the learned Primate Bramhall, the "greatest of our controversialists":—"We do not ask any man to

reject the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, yet neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving health, or legacies of the Church and Apostles, but in a mean as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of peace and unity, neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them." Here is evidently meant, as a whole, those Articles which peculiarly affect us, for our opponents cannot truthfully assert that, for instance, we do not hold the first five as absolutely of Faith. As in times past certain Articles were omitted when the danger from certain sects ceased, because they had lost their power of affecting the Church, so may it happen again in the future.

The dictum of the learned Judge Stowell is worthy of notice, spoken by him and worded in a legal manner: "These Articles are not the work of a dark age, they are the production of men eminent for their erudition and attachment to the purity of true religion. They were framed by the chief luminaries of the Reformed Church with great care in Convocation. . . . It is repugnant to all rational interpretation to contend that the construction" (*i.e.*, explanation) "of the Articles should be left to the private persuasion of individuals."

And when we remember that the declaration that the Articles should be taken "in the literal and grammatical sense" was inserted by Archbishop Laud himself, and also that such pious and learned men as Bishops Bull, Hall, Stillingfleet, Jeremy Taylor—not to mention others—could accept them with quiet conscience, we need not hesitate to do likewise.

With regard to those deriving so much of their form from the Augsburg Confession, many people require to have their attention drawn to this fact, (1) that the "Protestantism"

of the genuine and original "Protestants" was far from coinciding with the tenets of Calvin or of Zwingli, or with those of more modern times which have usurped the title of "Protestants," also (2) that he who drew up the Augsburg Confession was the Catholic "eruditissimus et Græcanissimus" Melancthon who shows in his writings so great a reverence for the past.

The following quotation from this "Confession" exhibits the temper of mind and design of purpose which influenced those who compiled it: "Non enim aspernamus consensum Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, nec est animus nobis ullum novum dogma et ignotum sanctæ Ecclesiæ invehere in ecclesiam, nec patrocinari impiis aut seditionis opinionibus volumus, quas Ecclesia Catholica damnavit"; (3) that Luther while he did excellent work in drawing the attention of the Christian world to the iniquitous sale of indulgences—of which the Council of Trent forbad the continuance—fell away from the excellence with which he started, and that "it was not until *later years* that he counteracted the beneficial effects produced by his *former efforts*" (see Roscoe's "Life of Leo X.," Vol. II.).

People talk loosely, carelessly, about Luther, and are generally ignorant of the fact that his "Confession of Wurtemburg"—"the German Athens"—says: "We believe and confess . . . that the Church has the right of judging all doctrines . . . and that the Church has the right of interpreting Scripture"—words hardly in accord with the views of modern Protestants, so-called, who claim to have the right and power of interpreting the Holy Bible according to their "private interpretation," with, moreover, a practical claim to infallibility, popes unto themselves.

The Augsburg Confession has been spoken of thus—and

the description does not to us seem forced—"This Confession, in the mildness of its tone, the gracefulness of its diction, and the general perspicuity of its arrangement, is worthy of its gifted author: while in the theological terminology it everywhere adheres, as closely as the truth permitted, to the existing standards of the Western Church. Melancthon seems indeed to have been confident that he was treading in the steps of S. Augustine and the Early Fathers, all his protests were accordingly confined to modern innovations and distortions by which sectaries and schoolmen had been gradually corrupting the deposit of the Christian Faith."

The learned Bossuet, when consulted as to the best terms and manner of attempting reconciliation between the Roman Communion and those who honestly followed the principles of the Augsburg Confession, replied in this strain: "Inasmuch as Providence had allowed so much Catholic truth to be preserved in that Confession, that full advantage should be taken," etc. It should likewise be borne in mind that the Lutherans were willing to come to terms when they beheld with feelings of abhorrence the bareness-loving Zwinglians, and the Calvinists, with their accursed hardness and impudent self-satisfaction, drifting so far away from the past, having with an impious vanity cut the hawser, whereby the ship might have remained moored to the shore. Neither should it be forgotten that our "Thirteen Articles" of 1538-9 were an attempt to agreement, and, though they may never have possessed legal force, were probably the causeway which led to the "Thirty-nine," which latter may have existed in an embryo sketch as far back as 1549, though not actually and publicly produced until 1563.

We must not forget that up to the twelfth year of Queen

Elizabeth's reign, *i.e.*, 1570—the Romanistic persons still attended the Divine Services of the Church of England, and that then (April 27th) the Bishop of Rome launched forth the Bull "*Regnans in Excelsis*," in which he stigmatized Elizabeth as a bastard heretic, depriving her of the English Crown, and, absolving her subjects from their allegiance, handed over this country to the King of Spain. It was not until all this had happened that the Roman party withdrew themselves from our Churches, forming themselves into a protesting and schismatic communion. It should in fairness be remembered that this has been much regretted by a Pope, we mean as to the Bull. "We know that we may declare Protestants excommunicate as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth, and before him Clement VII. the King of England, Henry VIII.—but with what success? The whole world can tell we yet bewail it in tears of blood. Wisdom doth not teach us to imitate Pius V. or Clement VII." So spoke Urban VIII. barely half a century after the Spanish Armada.

Those of the present day, not being Roman Catholics, who profess to see in the Thirty-nine Articles a Protestant text-book, fail to follow their Puritan forebears who in 1595 at Lambeth endeavoured to introduce Calvinistic crudities, to which the rulers of the Church—naturally viewing with suspicion and dreading those "dona ferentes"—refused the slightest consent.

If the Thirty-nine be Protestant-Calvinistic, why did these sectaries desire changes and additions? They felt that the Articles were against them, and that Articles XV., XVI., and XVII., were opposed to their views. The Protestant Shibboleths are absent, we cannot find a single one of "The Five Points" of Calvinism, while Luther's

most important doctrine of "Justifying Grace" does not appear, and the latter part of the Cathechism, the Offices of Baptism and Holy Communion, and the Twenty-fifth Article, certainly exclude the Zwinglian view that the Sacraments are merely bare symbols. In them no coalescence is shown between the Church of Rome and "the scarlet woman," or between Antichrist and the Pope of Rome, while the city itself is not identified with Babylon drunk with the blood of Saints. Nothing is uttered against auricular Confession, monastic vows, and orders, the use of images in Churches is by no means forbidden, we may have Crucifixes and candles there likewise—though as far as that goes the Lutheran Protestants place them in their Conventicles—Prayers for the departed are not forbidden, neither an intermediate and cleansing state, but only the "*Romish*" doctrine, the "doctrina Romanensium."

To condemn the particular aspect of a part of a general system is not, necessarily, to condemn that system. For instance, if a person say, "I reject the Homœopathic School of Medicine," does it follow that he objects to all medicine, and to the treatment and care of an Allopath? He may reject one doctrine of medicine, it does not follow that he rejects the whole system of medicine.

We cannot accept the Tridentine Council, if for no other reason than that it was not a free Council. So much so that Lansacc—at one time French ambassador to the Papal Court—objected to some matters being left to the decision of the Pope at Rome, instead of being settled by the Council, suggesting that he should allow freedom to the Assembly in deliberation, and "not send the Holy Spirit in a carpet bag to Trent from Rome."

Moreover, it may be held that Churches not represented

or taking part in a Council are not bound by the decrees of that Council, though they may accept them after due consideration.

We refer the reader to the opinion expressed of the Council by the Archbishop of Granada in the seventeenth session, and that by Francisco de Vargas, Attorney General in Spain to the Emperor Charles V.

Started by those astute connoisseurs in statecraft, Paul III. and Charles V., it was removed to Bologna for some time, perhaps lest the reforms so strongly urged by the Spanish Church—which would give her Bishops independence—should be secured by the vast personality of the Emperor; the Council was transported back to Trent in 1551.

The nature and quality of the Council have been well put forth by a modern writer in these words: "The Roman Theology at the Council of Trent represents no final settlement. It is theology at the half-way house between Catholicity pure and simple, and ultramontane Romanism"—*i.e.*, the *Romish* doctrine—not the old Roman—referred to in Article XXII.

Assuming that there exist in some persons of our Church a too latitudinarian view, or even views, of a negative or destructive character, "if the presence of a sceptical or merely subjective element be fatal to the idea of a Church, then mediæval Christianity is gone, for it is well known to all scholars that from the days of Scotus Erigena, and still more from those of Roscelin, William of Champeaux and Abelard, Christendom was honeycombed with a subtle and widespread rationalism, which was scarcely grappled with by authority till the condemnation of Amabric of Bena (A.D. 1209), and David of Dinant (A.D. 1209), or by philosophy, till S. Thomas Aquinas took the matter in hand,

and gave theology a fresh start, enabling it to offer a reply to the new and unsolved problems of which the simpler and less introspective age which preceded had been scarcely conscious."

This quotation is taken from a very fair and thoughtful article on "The Dogmatic Position of the Church of England" in a magazine always repaying the reader desirous of solid information, "The Church Quarterly Review"—see July, 1878. We make no apology for here inserting a whole page from this same article; to omit it would cause a loss.

The Church of England's "standard of appeal, whether rightly chosen or not, is the judgment of the ancient undivided Church; altogether irrespective of the question whether that judgment coincide in any respect with the teaching of Rome or of the sects. As a fact, the body of doctrine which she holds in common with Rome is larger, more definite, and more clearly ascertainable than that which she has in common with the separatist bodies; and it would take far less literary adaptation and excision to harmonize the Breviary and Missal with her formularies, than the Westminster Confession and the Longer Catechism. In some respects she is absolutely at one with the Roman Church, or else far nearer to her, as in sacramental teaching, than to Zwinglians, for example, while in other respects, she declines to accept post-œcumenical pious opinions and usages, which have crystallized into dogmas and cults. And as regards even those of the Thirty-nine Articles to which exception is taken by Latin and Oriental divines, it is to be remembered, firstly, that their position, as defined by Archbishop Bramhall (with whom many other great theologians agree), is only that of 'pious opinions, or *inferior* truths, which are proposed by the Church of England to all her

sons *as not to be opposed;* not as essentials of faith *necessary to be believed* by all Christians'; and, next, that the very same Convocation of 1873, which recast and issued the Articles, also framed this canon for their interpretation by all preachers. 'In the first place, they shall provide that they never teach aught by way of sermon which they desire to be devoutly held and believed by the people, save that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and *which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered from the said doctrine*, and whereas those Articles of the Christian religion agreed on by the Bishops in a lawful and holy synod . . . are doubtless drawn from the sacred books of the Old and New Testament . . . they shall confirm them by their signature.' This canon makes it unlawful to teach the Lutheran view of Justification, the Zwinglian view of the Ministry and Sacraments, the Calvinist view of the Eucharist, and many such tenets, because historically modern, and undiscoverable in the writings of ancient Christian authors; while it also obliges us to put a Catholic interpretation, and no other, on Articles whose wording seems at first sight to make the other way. The real truth of the English position is the historical fact which was received with such a storm of angry denial when Dr. Newman stated it in Tract XC., namely, that the Anglican formularies were the resultant of two dynamic forces, those of the old and of the new learning, and were deliberately intended to include both, though history leaves no doubt that, had Edward VI. survived, and the Zwinglo-Calvinist party, which enjoyed the favour of the civil government, been able to carry out its programme, many of the ambiguous expressions in the Articles (as, for example, those of Article XXIII., XXIV. of 1552—on ministering in

the congregation) would have been used to bring in and cover revolutionary changes, reducing the Church to the level of the Congregationalist body at Frankfort. That is to say—and although no such far-sighted idea presented itself to the Tudor Reformers—the actual outcome of the struggle was that the Church of England became the mid term of reconciliation between the principles of stability and of progress, of individualism and of unity, seemingly antagonistic, but amply capable of being harmonized in practice.

"Something of logical consistency is no doubt lost by such an attitude, but never was S. Ambrose's wise saying more pertinent, 'Non in dialecticâ complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum' *(De Fide I., v. 42)*."

CHAPTER II.

Prayers for the Departed.

OF the seven headings under which the Thirty-nine Articles are generally arranged, the fourth—on the Church Catholic (XIX.-XXIV.)—contains that to which the attention of the reader is now invited, viz., the twenty-second "*Doctrina Romanensium* de purgatorio, de indulgentiis, de veneratione, et adoratione, tum imaginum, tum reliquiarum, necnon de invocatione sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur: imo verbo Dei contradicet" (1563). "*The Romish doctrine* concerning Purgatory Pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God" (1571).

This Article we arrange in two main divisions:—

I. (1) *Purgatory*, including the two connecting doctrines, (2) Pardons and Indulgences, (3) Invocation of Saints.

II. Worship and adoration, (1) of images, whether sculptured figures or paintings, (2) of relics.

The Twenty-third Article of *1552-3* treated "of Purgatory," and was therefore the forerunner of our Twenty-second. The wording of this Twenty-third is as follows:—"*The*

doctrine of School-authors concerning Purgatory, Pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images, as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly feigned and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

To an observant mind reading these two English Articles and the one Latin, the question and thought will at once occur, in all probability, "Why does a difference of wording exist, namely of those words in italics, why in the Article of 1552-3 do we read 'the *doctrine of the school-authors*' and in 1563 '*doctrina Romanensium*,' translated in the English of 1571 as '*the Romish doctrine*'?"

Is it because of the Tridentine Council? Certainly not, and for this reason, that whereas the English Articles were signed before February 10th, 1563, the doctrines of the Roman Council were not promulgated until December 4th in the same year.

We may assume that the learned and clear-headed framers of the Article saw and understood somewhat of the signs of the times, and that certain events in the Council of Trent had cast their shadows before; we may suppose, therefore, that the above alteration was to prepare to meet the Romish doctrine of Purgatory henceforth to be a dogma, the acceptance of which by Romans is, perhaps, considered absolutely necessary to the attainment of everlasting life.

"The doctrine of the School-authors" refers to statements made by Schoolmen of the Middle Ages who evoked a theology plus philosophy, often competing with one another in producing far-fetched ideas, and who frequently thought more about dialectics than about simplicity and clearness: the groundwork of their science being based upon the illimitable platform of metaphysics, the nature of *genera* and *species*,

of Universals; the central point of contention being whether substantiality, true realness, belong to the species or to the individual; whether they exist in and by themselves and separate from individuals, or only as bare conceptions in the mind, whether abstract ideas be actual realities or not. This question, carrying us outside physical realities, beyond the limits of this world, led people to discuss not only such a subject as whether an angel, flying from one point and arriving at another, traversed the space lying between them, but even such important and vital doctrines as the Nature and Unity of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, and the nature of the Real Presence in the Eucharist.

That there was a good as well as a useless side, a Catholic as well as a rationalistic aspect, in Scholasticism, we must never fail to remember.

We had attached to this volume, as an Appendix-Chapter, a short account—as far as such a subject could be treated with brevity, which indeed may be impossible!—of the Schoolmen, but have withdrawn it for good and various reasons: thinking also that the references to their doctrines contained in this book may prove sufficient, *e.g.*, of S. Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Albertus Magnus, Alexander of Hales, etc.

Various presumptions on Purgatory, as to its locality and qualities, were in vogue among the ranks of the Schoolmen; ideas and explanations had been continually cropping up, and the subject up to the time of the Council of Trent had been a matter of opinion, the Council of Florence notwithstanding. But in the year 1563 the subject had, by the decree on Purgatory, become petrified into a concrete mass sufficiently defined; no longer was the subject a mere private pious opinion of the most ultra.

On this subject our first task is to show how the erroneous "Romish doctrine" arose and expanded, tracing it from the Catholic doctrine *of praying for the faithful departed*—for almost every error and heresy is a perversion, a distortion, of some doctrine at once Primitive, Catholic, Universal.

Inasmuch as the "Bible is the armoury out of which every man may choose his own weapon" we ourselves do not quote therefrom, nor refer to any work from the Apocrypha, in proof that prayers for the departed are lawful. Moreover, there are valuable commentaries thereon, written by devout and learned men, to which the anxious enquirer may refer. Neither do we intend quoting ancient epitaphs taken from those primitive Catacombs of Rome in attestation that such prayers were used at a period so very nigh unto the actual foundation of the Church of Christ.

To us members of the Church Catholic, Apostolic, Anglican, it should be sufficient to apply, as witness and proof of the truth of any doctrine, the celebrated Canon, or rule, of S. Vincent of Lerins (A.D. 434), "Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est."

By us the doctrines of the Primitive Church—which I. Edward VI. c. i. 7 states as consisting of the Church "500 years or more after the Ascension," that is all that was accepted by the undivided Church up to the time of Pope Symmachus—by us the doctrines of the Primitive Church are to be cordially accepted, and strenuously held.

Cranmer himself, at his trial in 1553, affirmed "that the order of the Church of England . . . is the same as was used in the Church fifteen hundred years past," showing that he claimed continuity for the Church of England, and that she was not divorced from primitive lines.

"For fourteen or fifteen centuries prayers had been offered

for those who died in the Lord, there was not a Liturgy from the very beginning, either in the East or the West, which did not contain such petitions, and yet, in the face of this usage, the unbroken usage of the Church universal, because the Catholic belief in the intermediate state had been confounded with the errors of Purgatory they"—the Foreign Reformers—"paraded their pernicious rule, 'the abuse is a sufficient reason for the disuse,' and disallowed in their cold and loveless creed even thanksgiving for the good example of a departed Saint."

These words from Dean Luckock's "Studies in the History of the Prayer Book" require no bolstering up from the pen of the unknown person who writes or compiles this essay; the Dean's works teem with historic proofs in favour of what he asserts; but for the general reader some examples of prayers for the faithful departed are here given.

The Early Liturgies show us the universal and primitive custom of praying for the departed.

Originally, the names of those departed commemorated and prayed for were written on tablets called "*Diptychs*," because they were folded in two. The contents were read out during the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, and this custom lasted until the ninth or tenth century. Eventually this fell into desuetude, and the faithful departed were simply commemorated in the Canon.

However much Protestants and ignorant people may deny the fact—"most ignorant of what they are most assured"—and however much the origins and dates of the Primitive Liturgies may be disputed, there has never been any sensible doubt that the departed were mentioned and prayed for in the Eucharistic Office from such primitive times, and that the custom was Catholic, that is universal

(see Smith's "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities"). The Syriac Liturgy of S. James of Jerusalem, parts of which may reasonably be attributed to about the first century, has, "Remember, O Lord God, the spirits of all flesh . . . do Thou Thyself give them rest there in the land of the living in Thy Kingdom, in the delight of Paradise," etc.: or, "Wherefore we make commemoration of them, that whilst they stand before Thy throne they may remember our humility and weakness, and, together with us, offer unto Thee this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice for the safe keeping of the living, for the consolation of the weak and the unworthy, such as we are, for the repose and happy memory of them who have long since departed in the true faith, our fathers," etc., etc.

In some MSS. of this oriental Liturgy are found the following words: "Behold the oblation is offered, and behold the souls are purified. Let repose be obtained thereby for the dead on whose behalf it is offered. That oblation which is brought by the living for the dead expiates the iniquity of the soul, and by it their sins are remitted."

From the Greek Liturgy of S. Mark of Alexandria: "Give rest, O Sovereign Lord our God, to the souls of all those who are in the Tabernacle of Thy Saints in Thy Kingdom," etc.

The Liturgy of S. John Chrysostom (about A.D. 390)—commonly called "the Golden-Mouthed," in use throughout Greece and Russia, the Churches of which countries are so anti-Roman and anti-Papal—uses these words at the Offering of the Spotless Sacrifice, after the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit on the elements and the Great Intercessory Prayer: "And further, we offer prayer to Thee, this reasonable service, on behalf of those who have departed in

the Faith; our ancestors, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Abstinents, and every just spirit made perfect in the Faith." Then, aloud, the Celebrant continues, "*especially our glorious Lady the Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary*"—which last phrase in italics we shall refer to again in treating of Mariolatry.

The Coptic Liturgy of S. Cyril (Bishop of Jerusalem A.D. 350) contains these words: "Grant rest to our Fathers and Mothers who have fallen asleep, and whose souls Thou hast received. Be *mindful also of all the Saints who have pleased Thee from the* beginning." Many others, "Patriarchs, Prophets, *Apostles, Martyrs*," are prayed for, "believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls for whom the supplication is put up while that holy and most awful Sacrifice is presented." The latter portion is taken from the Catechetical Lectures, and shows the tone and doctrine of the Liturgy, which lectures (Κατηχήσεις) are twenty-three in number, "the first example of a popular compendium of religion."

The Liturgy of S. Basil the Great (about A.D. 360) has practically the same wording, and follows exactly the prayer for the Blessed Virgin. In both, the next prayer is, "And remember all those who are departed in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life."

From the Canon in the Liturgy of Rome we take the following prayer: "Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and handmaidens which have gone before us with the sign of faith and sleep the sleep of peace. To them, O Lord, and to all those who are at rest in Christ, we beseech Thee that Thou wouldst grant a place of refreshment, of light, and of peace."

Not only is this prayer a proof that prayers for the

departed were in use in very early times, but likewise it shows adversely against "the Romish doctrine of Purgatory"—to be treated of later on.

Also in other Liturgies we find testimony; there are three Liturgies in use among the Christians of remote Assyria, known commonly as "Nestorians": it is the Persian rite.

1. The Liturgy of Mâr Adâi and Mâr Mâri of the Seventy, commonly called the Liturgy of the Apostles. "Mâr" means "Saint," or "Lord"; we call a Bishop "My Lord."

In this Eucharistic Office the Celebrant, having signed the Sacraments, prays: "O Lord God the Mighty, accept this Oblation for the whole Catholic Church, for all the just and righteous Fathers who approved themselves before Thee, for all the Prophets and Apostles, for all the Martyrs, for all the sorrowful and distrest, for all the dead who have departed from among us." We may add that Mâr Mâri died A.D. 82. It is claimed for him, so we have read, that he was one of the Seventy disciples sent forth by our Lord.

2. The Liturgy of Mâr Teodorus of Mopsuetia in Cilicia, "the Interpreter of Holy Scripture," prays: "Yea, O Lord our God, in Thy Grace accept from us this Sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our reasonable lips, that it may stand before Thee as an acceptable Memorial for the righteous of old, for the holy Prophets and saintly Apostles, for the Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, Doctors, Priests, and Deacons, and for all the children of the Holy Catholic Church who have departed this life in the true faith."—Here the Celebrant signs himself with the sign of the Cross—"That in Thy Grace, O Lord, Thou mayest forgive them all the sins and ignorances which they committed in Thy sight in this world while (endowed) with a mortal

body and an unstable spirit." Mâr Teodorus died A.D. 428.

3. Lastly, the Liturgy of Mâr Nestorius—Patriarch of Constantinople, died about A.D. 439—"Quicken the dead who have slept in Thy hope, and in Thy Grace; make them to stand at Thy right hand" . . . The Priest, bending his body, says, "And we beseech Thee, O Lord, and supplicate before Thee to remember, through this oblation, the Fathers, the Patriarchs, the Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, Doctors, Priests and Deacons, and all those of our Ministry who have departed this life, and all our Brethren in Christ, and all who have departed this life in the true faith, whose names are known to Thee. Pardon and forgive them in whatever they have sinned or transgressed against Thee, seeing that they were by nature inclined to evil," etc.*

According to the use of the ancient Church of Armenia, after the Consecration of the Elements, the Celebrant, having prayed for the living in a low voice, does so likewise for the departed in these words: "By this Sacrifice give rest to the Patriarchs, the Teachers, the Prophets, the Apostles, to all Martyrs, to all Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Clergy of Thy Holy Church, and to all the laity, both men and women, who have departed in the Faith of Thy Holy Church." Having commemorated the Blessed Virgin, Holy Apostles, Martyrs, etc., etc., and "all the Saints," the Choir sings, "Remember them, O Lord, and have mercy upon them." On a day when a Saint is especially commemorated, the Deacon says, "Let the Saint be commemorated in this Holy Sacrifice"; the Choir sings, "Remember him, O Lord, and have mercy upon him."

* Dr. Neale, in his "History of the Holy Eastern Church," gives us his opinion that the Nestorian Liturgy was older than the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), and was based on the Liturgy of the Apostles.

The Deacon then proceeds to commemorate, by name, thirty-eight holy persons, and refers to others, when the Choir sings again the preceding prayer for them.

Further on, the Deacon uses these words (praying): "For the repose of those who in faith and holiness have fallen asleep in Christ."

It is not unworthy of notice that those who have forsaken their ancient National Church and accepted Roman authority have been obliged to suffer a change, for the words "Have mercy upon *them*" now read "Have mercy upon *us*," a variant produced by the Roman authorities.

This helps to show that the former (and *original*) words bear sense opposed to the Romish doctrines of Purgatory, and of Invocation of the Saints. The Liturgies quoted show that the opinion held was that the faithful departed had rest, and that prayers were offered for a continual increase of rest and spiritual life—not that they were in torments. Also, the Saints being prayed *for* shows that they were not considered to be in Heaven, and therefore not to be prayed *to* that they might give us things.

We refer the reader to an interesting work, "The Armenian Church founded by S. Gregory, the Illuminator . . . of this ancient National Church," by E. K. F. Fortescue, with an Appendix by the Rev. S. C. Malan, published by J. T. Hayes.

The Rev. William Palmer (in his "Origines Liturgicæ or Antiquities of the English Ritual and a Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies," 2 vols., Oxford, 1836, Ind. ed., p. 94) says: "In Primitive times these commemorations" (*i.e.*, of the faithful departed) "were accompanied by prayers for the departed. *When* the custom of praying for the departed began in the Christian Church has never been ascertained.

We find traces of the practice in the second century, and either then or shortly after, it appears to have been *customary in all parts of the Church.* . . . According to the doctrine of the Catholic Fathers these blessed souls rest in peace, and joyfully await the time of their resurrection and perfection in eternal glory." Mr. Palmer testifies to the fact that from the fourth century "*all the Liturgies in the world contained such prayers.*"

"The prayers for the dead which occur in the Gallican Offices were certainly not offered with a view to their liberation from Purgatory; but rather *that they might have a part in the first resurrection,* and that *they might be received into the Kingdom of Heaven.* The following prayer supposes them to be in a state of quiet and repose: 'Remember also, O Lord, those who have preceded us with the sign of faith, *and sleep in the sleep of peace.* To them, O Lord, and to all *who repose in Christ,* we beseech Thee to grant a place of refreshment, light, and peace.'

"In the Gothico-Gallican missal we find the following prayers. *Orat. pro Spiritibus Pausantium:* 'O Jesus Christ, our life and resurrection, grant unto our fellow-priests, and our beloved who have reposed in Thy peace, the refreshment of the hoped-for mansion: and if any of them, deceived by the fraud of the devil, have polluted themselves with many stains of error, do Thou, O Lord, Who only art powerful, forgive them their offences; that those whom the devil gloried in as the companions of his damnation, he may lament, as being made through Thy mercy the companions of Thy joy.'

"Also in the *Missa Dominicalis* there is this prayer for the dead: 'Grant that they may pass into a state of repose, *and command that they be associated with Thy saints and elect in the*

first resurrection, that so they may be Thy portion in the land of the living.' And in another *Missa Dominicalis—Post Nomina:* 'We pray to Thee also in behalf of those who have preceded us in the Lord's peace, that, being freed from the terrors of hell *(ut tartareo horrore segregatos)*, and placed in Abraham's bosom, the Almighty may deign to raise them up in His first resurrection'" (Hart's "Ecclesiastical Records").

We may see then that the principle of prayers for the faithful departed is maintained by universal custom throughout "the whole Catholic Church of Christ," and so must not be repudiated by faithful and properly instructed members of the Church of England. And we should also know and recognize that the English Reformers did not object to the offering up of the Holy Unbloody Sacrifice for the souls of the faithful departed. What they rejected was the *trade* in "*the sacrifices of Masses*" (not "the sacrifice of the Mass") for the departed, which evil merchandizing had been protested against by the Anglican Bishops in the thirteenth century, (*cf.* "History of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages" (Das Mittelalter), by Dr. Wilhelm Moeller, pub. by Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London, 1893).

Not only in metropolitan centres of East and West was followed the pious custom of praying for the departed, but also in remote districts. The ancient Keltic Church offered prayers of this character.

At Gwnnws, near Aberyswith, in S. David's Diocese, there is, or was, a stone cross upon which was cut an Hiberno-Saxon inscription, and also the Latin words, "Quicunque explecavit hoc nomen det benedixionem pro anima Hiroidil, filii Catuconi." The reason for the locality is that many Irish Saints went to S. David's for their religious training. In Trinity College, Dublin, lies the

"Book of Durrow,"* the Gospels of S. Columba, which work dates from the sixth century, for the Saint founded the famous monastery at Iona about A.D. 563, and died in 597. According to the custom of the period, the author concludes his work with a request that the future readers of the volume would remember in their prayers the author and Priest; "Rogo beatitudinem tuam, sanctæ presbyter patriæ, ut quicunque hunc libellum manu tenuerit meminerit Columbæ scriptoris, qui hoc scripsi ipsemet evangelium per XII. dierum spatium gratia Domini nostri." Somewhat lower down, written in a contemporary hand, is the prayer "Ora pro me frater; 'Dominus tecum sit.'"—"Brother pray for me; 'the Lord be with thee.'"

Having shown that the Primitive Liturgies prove the universal acceptance of the principle of prayers for the faithful departed, we now turn to the Early Fathers to see what they say of the practice.

And lest certain people honouring these lines by perusal of them should ignorantly maintain that the Church of England cares not for Early Fathers, or for ancient Bishops, we refer such people to the following quotations from authorized documents of the Church, which show that our Church *does* appeal to the Primitive Church, Early Fathers, and ancient Bishops.

It was one of the most able and most remarkable of men living in the last century who proclaimed: "My Lords, you have here the lights of our religion: you have the Bishops of England, you have the true image of the Primitive Church in its ancient force, in its ancient ordinances, purified from the superstitions and vices which a long

* "Book of Durrow." S. Columba founded a famous monastery at Dairmogh in Leinster—better known as *Durrow*, now Derry.

succession of ages will bring upon the best institutions." These words were uttered by no less a genius than the great Edmund Burke.

Our opponents would assert that the present claims as to the genealogy and position of the Church of England date but from the Tractarian movement, and are the result of a "Ritualistic" and semi-popish conspiracy. But even amid the deadness of the eighteenth century it was the Church of this country, the Church of England alone in Europe, which produced sound apologies for the Christian religion, and contended against the flood of atheism which had spread over the leading countries of Western Europe. There existed among learned divines that recognition of our Church's claims which, though but as a rill in that wilderness of Erastian Whigdom, was yet to burst forth and refresh the Church in this century of mental conflict and earnest doubting.

The Convocation of 1571 which revised and republished the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion was the same assembly which passed the Canon forbidding the preaching of any doctrine "save that which has been gathered *out of the *Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops*."

Canon XXX. of 1603 appeals to Primitive and Apostolic doctrines, telling us that no separation from the Church of Rome was intended, or *from any Branch of the Catholic*

* "The Fathers are to be valued because their lives are rich in material for what the Apostle, in a phrase which for many readers has well-nigh lost its significance, speaks of as 'Edification': they laboured to build up the house of the Lord in human characters. They were typical men in whom the spiritual life was dominant, whose rock-like faith could strengthen then their brethren; who set loyalty to Christ above all earthly considerations, who made His Kingdom, as manifest in the Church, at once the home of souls, and the sphere of their best energies" ("Lessons from the lives of the Great Fathers," by William Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, etc.)

Church," "so far was it the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, etc.—and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they had fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity and from the Apostolic Churches which were their first founders."

The Catholicity of the Church Catholic, Apostolic, and Anglican, was claimed for her by the Pan-Anglican Synod of 1867, which learned Assembly expressed itself in these words: "We exhort you in love that ye keep whole and undefiled the faith once delivered to the Saints, as ye have received of the Lord Jesus . . . Abide steadfast in the Communion of Saints, wherein God hath granted you a place. Seek in faith for oneness in Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Hold fast the Creeds, and the pure worship and order which, of God's Grace, *ye have inherited from the Primitive Church*."

To Early Fathers and Bishops, writers and theologians, of the Primitive Church, do we now appeal as obedient and loyal to the Catholic Church of England.

The denial of an Intermediate State is a common error in the present day, being a Protestant rebound from Romish exaggeration. In the Middle Ages an opinion was current that the soul after the death of the body falls asleep, and will not awaken until the Judgment Day; but opinions on this view of the Intermediate State differ widely. This view will be referred to later on.

Tertullian (A.D. 200) is the first who speaks of prayers for the departed as generally in use throughout the Church, saying that it was customary for relations and friends to make oblations for a departed soul on his "birthday," that is, on the day of his entry into the higher life of Paradise. He

speaks of martyrs as going directly to Heaven, but this was a special gift to them, one not granted to other Christians ("De Anima").

S. Cyprian (240) also witnesses to such prayers from the fact that he forbade that the soul of a certain evil-doer should be prayed for: "Let no oblations be made for his repose (pro dormitione ejus), and no prayer be offered in his name in the Church" (Epist. I.); see also special cases of those who died in the Lord by pestilence ("Adv. Demetrium," "De Mortalitate").

S. Irenæus (A.D. 302), speaking of Christ's disciples, says that they "go to the invisible place determined for them by God, and there dwell, awaiting the Resurrection" ("Adv. Her.," V., xxxi.).

S. Chrysostom (in his Homilies) wrote: "Not in vain did the *Apostles order* that remembrance of the departed should be made in the Divine Mysteries . . . and this we do for those departed in the faith."

Likewise thus wrote Lactantius, "the Christian Cicero" (died c. 315): "Let no man think that souls are judged"—*i.e.*, in the General Judgment—"immediately after death: all are detained in one common dwelling-place of safe keeping until the day come when the Supreme Judge," etc.

Such was the opinion universally held in the Primitive Church. Not that another opportunity of better living will be given to conscious self-wilful unrepentant evil livers in this life, but that there would be for those waiting in Paradise a progression towards the states still above them. Perhaps not inconsequently a continual descent in the state presided over by the Devil.

S. Hilary of Poictiers (368) writes: "As the Day of Judgment is the eternal award either of joy or of punishment, so

the hour of death orders the interval for every man by its own laws, consigning him either to Abraham, or to punishment, until the Judgment."

S. John Chrysostom: "Let us not hesitate to afford help unto the departed and to offer up prayers for them, for the entire world has need of being purified" (Hom. 41).

S. Augustine said: "During the interval between death and the final Resurrection men's souls are kept in hidden receptacles, according as they severally deserve rest or trouble." On the subject of praying for the departed S. Augustine did speak most hopefully, and with no lack of distinctness, in his work entitled "Enchiridion":—"It must not be denied that the souls of the departed are relieved by the piety of their friends who are living, when for them the Sacrifice of the Mediator is offered. When the oblations, whether of the Altar, or of any alms, are offered for the departed that were baptized, for the very good they are thanksgivings, for those not very bad propitiations, for the very bad, even if they be of no advantage to the dead, yet they are at least consolations to the living":—but all this is remote from the "Romish Doctrine" of Purgatory and Indulgences.

S. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, thus wrote: "We offer up Christ sacrificed for our sins, propitiating our merciful God both for those that are fallen asleep, and for ourselves. Afterwards, also, on behalf of the Holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls for whom the supplication is put up, while that holy and most awful Sacrifice is present."

This passage shows belief in the Expectant, the Waiting Church joining with the Church Militant here on earth, and

deriving benefit from the Altar Services. Again we can read in the "Lectures" by the same Early Father: "For all who stand in need of succour we all supplicate and offer this Sacrifice . . . and for all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, believing it will be a great advantage," etc.

S. Ambrose (died A.D. 397): "Give rest to Thy perfect Theodosius, that rest that Thou hast prepared for Thy Saints." * He also writes: "The soul is separated from the body at death, and after the cessation of the earthly is held in an incomplete condition, ('Ambiguo suspenditur') awaiting the final judgment" ("De Cain et Abel," II.)

Gregory Nazianzen supposed that the souls of the righteous, before the resurrection of the body, are at once admitted into the presence of God; Gennadius and S. Gregory writes somewhat after the same manner; Eusebius speaks as though he held somewhat similar ideas. But we have absolute authority placed before us in "The Apostolical Constitutions," a work of Syrian origin dating certainly before the end of the fourth century, a portion being assigned to a date not later than the second century. Divided into

* It was of the Benedictine Fathers Hallam ("Literature of Europe," Vol. I., ch. i.) said, that almost all we possess of Latin Classic literature is owing to the industry of these monks. These Benedictines were the editors of the works of S. Ambrose, and they said, "It is not surprising that Ambrose should have written as he has done about the state of departed souls, but it seems to be almost incredible how uncertain and how various the Holy Fathers have been upon the same question from the very time of the Apostles to the pontificate of Gregory XI. (1370-1378) and the Council of Florence (1439), *i.e.*, a period of almost 1400 years. For not only does one Father differ from another, as in questions not yet defined by the Church was likely to happen, but they are not even found to be consistent with themselves" (quoted by Bishop John Henry Hopkins in his reply to Milner (1854, 2 vols., pp. 918). "We believe the Fathers, one and all, were perfectly agreed that there was an intermediate state called Paradise, and that the prayers of the living were beneficial to the faithful departed, but they differ in details. Yet we are to believe this (Romish) doctrine of Purgatory is from the tradition of the Fathers."

ten Books, the eighth contains the following prayer: "Let us pray for our brethren departed in the Faith of Christ, that the most merciful God, Who has received the spirits of the deceased, would pardon all their voluntary and involuntary failings, and that, being restored to the Divine favour, they may have a place assigned to them in the region of the blessed; in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; in the company of those where pain, and sorrow, and dissatisfaction have no place."

Philaret, in his "Sermons," wrote thus: "There are some Christians who deprive themselves of the consolation of prayers for the dead . . . Apparently from no other cause than that they do not understand how the efficacy of prayer can extend so far—from one world to another—from the visible to the invisible. . . . Efficacy of prayer for the living is possible, although it may not be explicable by reason. I say in my turn, do not then deny the efficacy of prayer for the dead, merely because it is inexplicable, or appears to be so."

The only serious objector in primitive times to prayers for the departed was Arius (A.D. 355) of Sebastia in Pontus. A heretic in his rejection of Catholic doctrine, a schismatic in his renunciation of true Church discipline, he maintained that a Bishop in no real sense differed from a priest; he declined to keep Easter, maintaining that the observation thereof was a clinging to Jewish fables. To these errors he added this that he observed Holy Week as a time of feasting, thus anticipating the treatment which Protestants of the present day in company with Nothingarians mete out to Good Friday. Being an Arian heretic he refused to accept the fundamental doctrine of the Christian Faith that Jesus the Christ was God and man, thus anticipating Unitarians who deny that our Blessed Lord was and is God.

The "Hypno-psychites" (from the Greek *hupnos* = sleep and *psuche* = soul) held the heretical view that "the destruction of the bodily organs reduced the soul to a state of powerlessness." It was a belief of the Middle Ages that the soul after the death of the body falls asleep, remaining in this inactive and unconscious state until the Day of Judgment; but opinions on this subject differed widely, and the subject itself was discussed at the Councils of Ferrara, Florence, etc.

Reformation Period. Only two years before the death of Henry VIII., namely in 1545, in the English Primer, we have: "O God to whom it is appropryed to bee merciful ever and to spare, be mercyful to the solles of thy servants of each kynde, and forgeve them all their sinnes, that they beyng leused from the bondes of death, may ascende unto life everlastyng, through Christ our lorde."

"O God, the lorde of pardon, graunt unto the solle of N. thy servant (the yeres mynd of whose death we have in remembrance) a place of rest, the blissful quiet and clereness of thy light. Through Christ our lorde."

"O God, that arte creatour and redemer of al faithful people: graunt unto the solles of all true belevers beyng dead, remission of al their sinnes, that through devout praiers they may obtayne thy gratious pardon, yt they have always desyred, whiche shalt come to iudge the quicke and dead, and the worlde by fyre. God have mercy on all Christen solles. Amen."

Turning further to Anglican divines of the Reformation period, and onwards, we find that Archbishop *Cranmer ordered such prayers* as are now under our notice. He presided over a commission comprising all the English Bishops, eight Archdeacons, and seventeen Doctors-in-Divinity; and one

result of this great meeting was to produce a famous book, namely, "The Institutions of a Christian Man," in 1554. Therein we read: "Forasmuch as due order of charity requireth, and the Book of Maccabees, and *divers ancient Doctors*, plainly show that it is a very good and charitable deed to pray for the souls departed; and forasmuch also as *such usage has continued* in the Church so many years, *even from the beginning*," etc., etc. Archbishop Cranmer was head of this commission, and Bishop Hugh *Latimer* was a member. The *latter* declared, in a sermon preached before Convocation, that the doctrine of prayers for the dead "*was never lost.*"

But previous to this date "The Bishops' Book"—which may be called another edition of the above work—published in March, 1537, declared "it standeth with the very order of Charity for Christians to pray for one another, both quick and dead."

Prayers for the departed were commanded by the ostensible order of a Sovereign generally looked upon as a Protestant Saint too good to live long in this world, namely, Edward VI., in "The Form of Bidding of Common Prayer":—"Thirdly, ye shall pray for all them that be departed out of this world in the faith of Christ, that they with us, and we with them, at the day of Judgment may rest both in body and soul with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven" ("Injunctions by Edward VI.," 1547).

In the "Liber Precum" of that "bright Occidental star," Queen Elizabeth, we also find prayers for the departed.

An examination of various editions of the Book of Common Prayer shows that though the principle of prayers for the departed was forced into the background—for the praiseworthy but unsuccessful attempt mentioned by Thorn-

dyke see further on—yet the framers of the Book, by what they allowed to remain, showed their belief in the principle.

Henry VIII. died on January 2nd, 1547, Edward VI. came to the throne January 28th in the same year.

The first Edwardian Prayer Book, presented to Convocation on November 24th, 1548, was laid before Parliament on January 15th, 1549, and passed both Houses on the 22nd. It was ordered to be used by the following Whitsuntide, but might be used by the following Easter if the book could be procured by that time, that is to say on April 21st.

(1) In this Prayer Book of 1549 the following Prayer occurs in the Burial Service: "We commend into Thy hands of Mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed, that when the Judgment shall come which Thou hast committed to Thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight," etc.

(2) Then follows in the next Prayer: "Grant, we beseech Thee, that at the day of judgment his soul, and all the souls of Thy elect departed out of this life, *may with us and we with them fully receive Thy promises, and be made perfect together*," etc.

(3) Another Prayer has: "Grant unto this Thy servant that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed to him, but that he, escaping the gates of Hell and eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the reign of light with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness."

This "First book, though it was the work of staunch Reformers, including amongst others the names of Cranmer and Ridley, did not satisfy the cravings for novelty which some of the changes at the Reformation had engendered" (Editor's Preface to "The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.," published by Parker and Co., 1883). This Prayer

Book was forced ahead by the invasion of German Protestants when the weak King, a mere boy, sat on the throne. Driven perforce, authorities of the Church still did their best to weather the storm, and managed to throw a powerful side-light upon events by causing words such as these to be inserted in the Act of Parliament by which this Prayer Book of 1552 was ratified, viz., by asserting that the *First* Prayer Book contained nothing but that which was "agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the state of this Realm." Not content with such a plain statement, the Act proceeded further to formulate a Catholic Protest, for it stated, "that such doubts as had been raised in the use and exercise thereof proceeded rather from the curiosity of the minister and mistakers than from any other worthy cause"; like many English people of our own times, our English Reformers objected to things "made in Germany." The First Act of Uniformity declared of the First Book that by the aid of the Holy Ghost it was with one uniform agreement concluded. This is part of the wording of the First Act of Uniformity of King Edward VI., passed January 22nd, 1549:—

"His Highness . . . hath appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain of the most learned Bishops and other learned men of this realm, to consider and ponder the premisses: And thereupon, having as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian Religion taught by the Scripture *as to the usages in the Primitive Church*, should draw and make one convenient order, rite and fashion of common and open prayer, and administration of the Sacraments, to be had and used in his Majesty's realm of England

and Wales; the which at this *time by the aid of the Holy Ghost* with one uniform agreement is of them concluded."

In this Second Prayer Book the prayer numbered 2 above was watered down until but little of the old wine was left to all appearance: "shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect and to hasten Thy Kingdom, that we with this our brother, and all other departed in the true faith of Thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss," etc.

But Wheatley (d. 1742)—in his well-known work on the Prayer Book—comments thus on this passage in the Burial Service of the 1552 Book: "There was one clause permitted to stand, viz., in the prayer that immediately follows the Lord's Prayer, in which, till the last review" (*i.e.*, that of 1661), "we prayed that 'we with this our brother, *and all others departed in the true faith of God's Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss.*' . . . That the sentence, as it is left standing, may well enough be understood to imply the *dead* as well as the living. For we pray (as it is now) that 'we with all those that are departed in the true faith of God's Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss,' which is not barely a supposition that all those who are so departed *will* have their perfect consummation and bliss, but a *prayer* also that they *may* have it, viz., that we with them, and *they* with us, may be made perfect together, both in body and soul, in the eternal and everlasting glory of God" (p. 472, ed. 1863).

It is believed that this Second Edwardian Prayer Book never received the sanction of Convocation.

See also Bishop Cosin's words a little further on: "Though the souls . . . yet to come."

We cordially agree with Bishop Horsley (1733-1806):

"The alterations which were made in the Communion Service as it stood in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. to humour the Calvinists were, in my opinion, *much for the worse*."

The Second Prayer Book of 1552 was not well received, and had the brief existence it deserved, for Queen Mary ascending the throne on July 6th, 1553, the Latin Missal was restored by one of the first Acts of her reign. In October of 1558 Mary died. Elizabeth, becoming Queen, desired to supply omissions in the 1552 Book, but the fires of Smithfield (which did not burn the great, the rich, the powerful, but four Bishops, and a host of poor men supporting themselves by manual labour chiefly,) had produced such a hatred of Rome, with its accompaniment of a Spanish or other foreign monarch, that it was impossible to do all she desired in a direction which to so many appeared to be of Popish inclination, but any alterations that were made tended towards the First Edwardian Book.

There was a wish, not unworthy in its aim, to comprehend as many as possible in the arrangement, in fact, all but Papists or extreme Protestants, and to deny to no single loyal person the Holy Communion.

We quote Froude, the well-known historian, to show this:—

"1559. The Commission for revising the Prayer Book had been busily at work, and on 18th April the report was brought forward in the House of Commons. The object had been so to frame the constitution of the Church of England, that disloyalty alone should exclude a single English subject from its Communion, who in any true sense could be called a Christian; so to frame its formulas, that they might be patient of a Catholic or Protestant

interpretation; that the Church should profess and teach a doctrine uniform in essentials; while in non-essentials, it should contain ambiguous phrases resembling the many watchwords that divided the world."

"The Articles were left in abeyance, *and happy would it have been for the Church of England had they never been revived.*

"The rubrics of Edward's Second Book were modified, and a large latitude allowed in the use of ornaments and vestments. In the Communion Service the words were restored which seemed to recognize the Real Presence" (Froude's "History of England," Vol. VII., p. 80).

The Elizabethan Prayer Book was brought into use on June 24th, 1559.

In the same year was issued a book of Private Prayers, and "The Primer set forth at large, with many godly and devout Prayers. Anno 1559."

In that portion called "*The Dirige*," after the Anthem, "I am the Resurrection and the Life," has been sung, and "Lord, give Thy people eternal rest, and light perpetual shine on them," we read: "O God, which by the mouth of S. Paul thine Apostle hast taught us not to wail for them that sleep in Christ, grant, we beseech thee, that in the coming of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ *both we, and all other faithful people being departed*, may be graciously brought unto the joys everlasting, which shalt come to judge the quick and dead, and the world by fire. Amen."

By these words was meant a prayer for the departed, as the next two prayers—following immediately on that just quoted—definitely pray for them.

"Almighty, eternal God, to whom there is never any prayer made without hope of mercy, *be merciful to the souls of thy servants being departed from this world* in the confession

of thy Name, that they may be associate to the company of thy Saints. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

"Lord, bow thine ears unto our prayers, wherein we devoutly call upon thy Name mercy, that thou wilt bestow the souls of thy servants which thou hast commanded to depart from this world, in the country of peace and rest, and cause them to be made partners with thy holy servants. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

In the earlier "*Orarium*" of 1546 this "*Dirige*" was called "*Vigiliæ Mortuorum*." (Taken from the edition edited for the Parker Society, Cambridge University Press, 1851, p. 67.)

The "learned theologian and metaphysician" Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, of Winchester (1555-1626), the friend of Grotius, thus wrote: "The Holy Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. . . . A Sacrifice is proper and applicable only to Divine worship. . . . The Sacrifice of Christ's Death is available for present, absent, living, dead (yea even for them that are yet unborn). When we say the dead, we mean it is available for the Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors, and all (because we are all members of one body)." These words were written in answer to Cardinal Perrone.

How can we deny the Bishop's teaching, those of us who have read the Liturgies of various Ancient Churches, and the statements of holy men of old? God, the Supreme Head, seems in His Divine Providence to have provided the right man in the right place for the defence of the Church of England, which, "on the one side was assailed by the Puritan divines, on the other by the theologians of Rome; and it was required of her to prove as against the former that she must be true to Catholic principles and traditions, as against the latter that she

was true to them in spite of her rejection of the 'Papacy.'" The man to lead the van against Puritan violence and Romish subtlety was the great Bishop Andrewes. Lord Bacon held him in "especial reverence"; "Casaubon could find no words sufficiently strong to express his admiration and affection." Bishop Andrewes presided over the learned Committee which superintended the issue of the present "Authorized Version" of the Holy Bible in 1611. Surely the opinion of so godly a man —of so learned a man, for he was acquainted with Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Greek, Latin, and ten other languages—should be deemed specially valuable.

Archbishop Usher (1580-1655) of Armagh, celebrated for his "immense erudition," in an article against Purgatory, replying to a Jesuit, says that prayers for the departed were primitive and Catholic, and quotes such prayers with the object of showing that prayers of this nature "were not such as are now used in the Church of Rome at this day." He adds further that such prayers are not necessarily part of the Romish error of Purgatory, and indeed were actually *opposed* to that error.

Archbishop Bramhall (1593-1663), says: "We condemn not all praying for the dead, not for their resurrection, and the consummation of their happiness, but their (*i.e.*, Roman's) prayers for their deliverance out of purgatory" ("Schism Guarded," Oxford Edition, II., 494). Again: "What forbids Christians to pray for this public acquittal, for this consummation of blessedness? So do we pray as often as we say, 'Thy Kingdom come,' or 'Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.' Our Church is yet plainer: 'That we with this our brother and all other departed in the faith of Thy Holy Name may have our perfect consummation of blessedness in Thy Everlasting Kingdom'" (Answer to the Epistle of M.

de la Millatiere, Ibid, I., 60). Again; in "Schism Guarded," refuting Wm. Serjeat, who had said of the Greeks, "They believe that the souls of the dead are bettered by the prayers of the living," the Archbishop says, "Which way are they bettered? That the souls of the damned are released or eased thereby, the modern Greeks deny, and so do we; that there are any souls in Purgatory to be helped, they deny, and so do we; that they may be helped to the consummation of their blessedness, and to a speedier union with their bodies by the resurrection thereof, they do not deny, no more do we" (Ibid, II., 633).

Bishop Cosin (1594-1672) of Durham, "almost without a rival in any age for acquaintance with Liturgical lore, the Decrees of Councils, and Patristic teaching," thus expressed himself:—"Though the souls of the faithful be in joy and felicity, yet, because they are not in such a degree of that joy and felicity as that they never can receive no more than that they have already . . . we beseech God to give them a full and perfect consummation of bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal Kingdom of glory which is yet to come. . . . Although it cannot be distinctly and exactly declared what benefit the dead receive by these prayers . . . yet if there be nothing else, there is this at least in it, that thereby is declared the communion and conjunction which we have still with one another, as members of the same body whereof Christ is the Head."

Speaking of the office of the Holy Communion, he says: "It is a true, real, efficient Sacrifice . . . propitiatory for the sins of the whole world; therefore, in the oblation following, we pray that 'it may so prevail with God, that we and all the whole Church of Christ *(which consists of more than those which are upon the earth)* may receive the benefit of it.'

The Puritans think that there is prayer for the dead allowed and practised in the Church of England, and so think I" ("Notes on the Prayer Book").

The wonderfully-minded Jeremy Taylor (1613-1637), Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore—"the Shakespear of English prose"—wrote: "*The Church prays for all persons that died in the Christian and Catholic Faith.*" "We should do well to remember . . . preserve the affections we bore to our dead when they were alive." The Bishop mentions several ways whereby these affections may be preserved, one being by "preserving their memories privately, and publicly keeping their memorials, and desiring of God, with a hearty and constant prayer, that God would give them a joyful resurrection and a merciful judgment, for so S. Paul prayed for Onesiphorus."

Moreover, in his "Dissuasive from Popery" (1664), Bishop Jeremy Taylor wrote: "Upon what accounts the Fathers did pray for Saints departed, and, indeed, generally for all, it is not now seasonable to discourse; but to say this only, that such general prayers for the dead as those above reckoned, the Church of England did never condemn by any express article, but left it in the middle."

Also does Bishop Taylor write: "We find, by the history of the Maccabees, that the Jews did pray and make offerings for the dead, which also appears by other testimonies and by their forms of prayers still extant which they used in the captivity. Now it is very considerable, that, given our Blessed Saviour did reprove all the evil doctrines and traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, and did argue concerning the dead and the Resurrection against the Sadducees, yet He spake no word against this public practice, but left it as He found it; which He, Who came

to declare to us all the will of the Father, would not have done if it had not been innocent, pious, and full of charity."

It may be permitted to quote in this place from the "Bidding Prayer" taken from Archbishop King's copy of Journals of the Irish Church Convocation of 1662 and 1665: "Ye shall praye for the Universall Catholicke Churche, both quick and *ded.* . . . On the thirde partie, ye shall praye for the sowles that be departed owt of this worlde in the faithe of our Lord Jesus Christe, whiche slepe in reste and peax."

That holy man, Bishop Ken of Bath and Wells (of which See as a non-juror he was deprived in 1684), author of the beautiful evening hymn, "Glory to Thee, my God, this night," thus expressed himself in his well-known "Devotions" published in 1686: "O my God, let it be Thy good pleasure . . . to gather both living and departed again together, to hasten Thy Kingdom of glory, that I, and all those who wait for Thy living breath, whether they be in the flesh, *or sleeping in* Christ, may in the Church Triumphant eternally love, praise," etc.

Thorndyke (d. 1672) says that explicit prayers for the departed were erased from the Book of Common Prayer in order to try and win over the Puritans, but without the desired effect, very naturally—the Hampton Court Conference showed their unreasonableness—and the Bishop writes: "To take away all prayers for the dead is not paring off abuses, but cutting to the quick." To however great an extent prayers for the departed have been diluted, the principle of these prayers seems to have been sufficiently left in the words retained, for the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference in 1661 requested the insertion of the following

Rubric in our Burial Service: "The exhortation in the Office is intended for the comfort and edification of the living, and not for the dead": a request not granted.

Bishop Bull (1634-1710), commenting on and translating certain words of S. Irenæus, wrote: "It is the divine disposition that those who are saved should *per gradus proficere*—should proceed by degrees to their perfect beatitude." The complete significance of this is evident when we reflect that these words of S. Irenæus are a commentary on our Blessed Lord's words, "In My Father's House are many mansions." This intermediate state of progression was evidently believed in by the Primitive Church, for S. Irenæus was living in A.D. 200.

The Bishop, in his sermon "Concerning the Middle State of happiness or misery . . . inconsistent with the Popish Doctrine of Purgatory," tells us about prayers for the departed, and that in a simple and interesting manner: "The same Justin Martyr . . . condemns it as an error in the Gnostics, that they held, That as soon as they die, their souls are received up into Heaven, *i.e.*, the highest Heaven . . . That the souls in Paradise do enjoy the conversation and sight of angels and archangels, and also of our *Saviour Jesus Christ by way of vision*, viz., such in its kind, though in degree far more excellent, as whereby the prophets saw Him of old. But to return to Irenæus, he concludes his discourse in that chapter thus: That it is the divine ordination and disposition that those that are saved should *per gradus proficere*, 'proceed by degrees,' to their perfect beatitude, that is, that they should, as S. Ambrose speaks, 'through the refreshments of Paradise, arrive to the full glories of the Heavenly Kingdom.' . . . Now to proceed, from what has been said it appears that the doctrines of the distinction of

the joys of Paradise, the portion of good souls in their state of separation, from that yet fuller and most complete beatitude of the Kingdom of Heaven after the resurrection, consisting of that clearest vision of God, which the Holy Scriptures call seeing Him *face to face*, is far from being Popery, as some have ignorantly censured it, for we see it was the current doctrine of the first and purest ages of the Church."

Proceeding to speak of the Council of Florence, and its decree concerning Purgatory, Bishop Bull says that the decree was "chiefly to introduce their purgatory, and that the prayers of the Ancient Church for the dead might be thought to be founded on a supposition that the souls of some faithful persons after death go into a place of grievous torment. . . . The prayers for the dead, used in the Ancient Church . . . were of two sorts; either the common and general commemoration of all the faithful deceased at the oblation of the Holy Eucharist, or the particular prayers used at the funerals of any of the faithful lately deceased. The former respected the consummation of bliss at the Resurrection, like as that which our Church useth both in the Office for the Communion and in that for the Burial of the Dead; which indeed seems to be no more than what we daily pray for in the petition of the Lord's Prayer (if we rightly understand it) *Thy Kingdom come*. The latter were also charitable omens and good wishes of the faithful living, as it were accompanying the soul of the deceased to the joys of Paradise, of which they believed it already possessed. . . . In a word, let any understanding and unprejudiced person attentively observe the prayers for the dead in the most undoubtedly ancient Liturgies, especially those in the Clementine Liturgy, and those mentioned in the Ecclesi-

astical Hierarchy, and he will be so far from believing the Romish purgatory on the account of those prayers, that he will be forced to confess they make directly against it" (George Bull, Bishop of S. David's. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1827).

Bishop Butler (1692-1752) of Durham (who so helped to demolish the confused collection of ideas which were included in the general term "Deism") does not say anything about prayers for the departed, at least, we have been unable to find any paragraph thereon, either in his "Analogy" or his sermons. But we have seen it stated in print that he speaks favourably concerning prayers of this quality; perhaps we have overlooked the reference. He certainly says that in the next life "we shall still continue the same creatures we are, with wants to be supplied." Also that experience shows us that man is in a state of trial in this life, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that in a future state we shall be in a state of trial also.

Prayers for the faithful departed are used on an understanding that their state is an imperfect one. If, in the next life, they have wants to be supplied, then still they are far from being perfect, they must be in a state of progress—their state and nature cannot be either stationary or decadent—therefore must they be in a state of preparation, and prayers for them logical.

Mr. Gladstone, in his "Studies Subsidiary to Butler's Works," writes: "The Christian dead are in a progressive state, and the appointed office of the interval between death and the resurrection is reasonably believed to be the corroboration of every good and holy habit, and the effacement of all remains of infirmity and vice. . . . We have no right to assert that 'the redeeming and consummating

process' will be accomplished without an admixture of salutary and accepted pain."

(See on S. Catherine, towards the end of the next chapter.)

Dr. Welldon, in his "The Hope of Immortality," says: ". . . it is reasonable to believe that the souls, which enter upon the future state with the taint of sin clinging to them in whatever form of degree, will be slowly cleansed by a disciplinary or purificatory process from whatever it is that, being evil in itself, necessarily obstructs or obscures the vision of God." Dr. Welldon is, we believe, a "broad-minded Evangelical."

The well-known historian Joseph Mede, "an acute logician, master of many languages, of extraordinary learning," who lived between 1586 and 1638, speaking of the Eucharistic Service, thus expressed himself: "The prayers that we add thereto in presenting the death and merits of our Saviour to God are not only beneficial to them that are present but to them that are absent also, to the dead and the living both, to all true members of the Catholic Church of Christ."

Dr. John Overall—Bishop of Lichfield from 1614 to 1618, of Norwich from the latter date to that of his death—bids us read "a whole army of Fathers," as evidence that prayers for the departed, especially in the Eucharist Office, were commonly in use at an early period.

The saintly Bishop Wilson—died March 5th, 1755, in the fifty-eighth year of his consecration—we love to quote; he prayed "for all such as have departed this life in the true fear of God, and especially for all such for whom I am obliged more especially to pray, for my father, mother, etc., that God would grant them rest and peace in the mansions of the blest, in hope of a blessed resurrection."

Bishop Heber (1783-1826), writing on the subject of prayers for the departed, says: "My own opinion is on the whole favourable to the practice."

Dr. Johnson, on Easter Day 1759, wrote the following prayer: "And, O Lord, so far as it may be lawful, I commend unto Thy Fatherly goodness my father, brother, wife, and mother, beseeching Thee to make them happy, for Jesus Christ's sake" (see Croker's "Boswell," p. 823; Dr. Johnson mentioned them in the order in which they had died).

That learned divine Joseph Bingham (1688-1723), (author of the well-known "Origines Ecclesiasticæ" or "The Antiquities of the Christian Church,") speaking of the grounds upon which the Ancient Church prayed for the souls of the departed, of Saints, Martyrs, Confessors, as well as of others, the said Bingham remarks: "That she did not do it upon the supposition of Purgatory appears evident from what has been already observed out of the public offices of the *Church, that she prayed for all the Saints, Martyrs, Confessors, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and even the Blessed Virgin herself, and all other holy men* and women, from the foundation of the world, who were supposed to be in a place of rest and happiness, and not in any place of purgation or torment" (p. 780, pub. Reeves and Turner, 1878). The historian continues his argument in the following words: "Another reason for praying for the dead was, they conceived all men to die with some remainder of frailty and corruption, and therefore desired that God would deal with them according to His mercy, and not in strict justice according to their merits. *These prayers are not made upon the Romish superstition of the souls being in Purgatory, or in any place of torment, but on principles that utterly overthrow it.*"

Bishop Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham from 1791-1826: "All doctrines of Purgatory do not appear to be condemned by our Article, and that there are several doctrines is manifest from history. There is the doctrine of Origen, the teaching of Augustine, the statement put forth at the Council of Florence, and the latest doctrine of Trent. But even this latter is not condemned, because it was put forth *after* our Articles were promulgated. Prayers for the dead are not anywhere condemned by authority, except where they imply the *Roman* doctrine concerning Purgatory. *Requiescat in pace* does not appear to involve this" (MS. Letter with regard to inscriptions on monuments erected during his episcopate to Dr. Routh, of Oxford, quoted from "The Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed," by the Rev. Frederick George Lee, D.C.L. New Edition, 1875, pp. 179-180).

Of a later date (1818-1866) we have the testimony of the author of the well-known hymns, "Jerusalem the Golden," "Brief life is here our portion," the learned liturgist, Dr. John Mason Neale, who says: "The more the whole body of ancient Liturgies is examined the more clearly two points appear—(1) That prayers for the dead, and more especially the oblation of the Blessed Sacrament for them, have been from the beginning the practice of the Universal Church; (2) *this without any idea of a Purgatory of pain, or of any state from which the departed soul has to be delivered as being one of misery*" ("Essays on Liturgiology").

We now refer to writings of our own more immediate contemporaries, *e.g.*, Dr. Pusey: "And however in evil days the public and ritual use of those prayers was laid aside in the Church of England, yet even a Court of Ecclesiastical Law formally decided their lawfulness,

according to the doctrine and discipline of the Church" (see the case of Breeks against Woolfrey).

"The pious oblations for the pious dead are still, after the example of primitive antiquity, offered up by the truly Apostolic Church of England whenever she celebrates the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in the Blessed Eucharist."

Bishop Harold Browne, of Winchester, not long gone from us in the flesh, wrote: "Still we retain a thanksgiving for Saints departed, a prayer that *we with them* may be partakers of everlasting glory." By inverting the order of the words in italics—and, we think, without forcing them to express a meaning unintended—we may the more easily perceive that prayers for the departed are implied—"that they with us," etc. (*cf.* "Form of Bidding of Common Prayer," Edw. VI.).

But we do not press this; the words may mean nothing more than a grateful commemoration. But in our Burial Service there is a prayer for the departed quite as definite as it is direct, not less so because of its brevity: "That we, with all those that are departed in the true faith . . . may have our perfect consummation," etc., etc. Even the host of "The Protestant Alliance" cannot make out that "the departed" means "the living" here on earth.

Dean Plumptre, appointed Dean of Wells in 1881, writes: "In every form, from the solemn Liturgies which embodied the belief of the Church's profoundest thinkers and truest worshippers, to the simple words of hope and love which were traced over the graves of the poor, her voice went up without a doubt or misgiving, in prayers for the soul of the departed" ("The Spirits in Prison").

In our Burial Service the words, "Man that is born of a

woman," etc., are appointed to be sung as an anthem if the choir be present. The well-known commentator, the Rev. John Henry Blunt, tells us that the original words are traced back to Notker, a monk of S. Gall who lived in the close of the *ninth* century. Mr. Blunt thus comments on these words: "When sung to such strains as befits its beautiful words this anthem has a solemn significance, and at the same time a wailing prayerfulness which makes it unsurpassable by any analogous portion of any ritual whatever. It is the prayer of the living for themselves and for the departed, when both are in the Presence of God for the special object of a final separation (as far as this world and visible things are concerned) until the Great Day. At such a season we do not argue about prayers for the departed, but we pray them. For them, and for ourselves we plead the mercies of the Saviour before the eternal Judge" ("Annotated Book of Common Prayer").

This Anthem is peculiar to the English Burial Service, and never had a place in any part of the Roman Breviary.

The two following quotations are noteworthy:—

(1) From a sermon preached by Canon Wilberforce in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday afternoon, Nov. 3rd, 1895, having for subject, "The Communion of Saints"—the previous Friday having been the "Festival of All Saints." His quotation from Archbishop Magee may be part of that Prelate's utterance referred to in connection with a Church in Leicester.

"And I confess that I do not see in what our Christian religion is better than utter materialism if we allow ourselves to change to them (the departed). For example, how can a Christian yield for a single moment to that blinding superstition, which would dare to silence our prayers for

our loved ones as soon as the silver cord of physical life is loosed and the golden bowl of visible embodiment is broken. Archbishop Magee, who was above all things a Protestant, has said: 'Prayers for the progress of the departed abound in the early liturgies of the Church, and especially in connection with Holy Communion. To say that such prayers savour of Popery is not only unjust and uncharitable, but in regard to our controversy with Rome, extremely rash and unwise.' I would venture to add it is more than rash and unwise; it is sheer stolid, stupid, Paganism. It is utterly idle to question how our beloved can be benefited by our prayers. If the Infinite Mind can set free influences for good in response to our prayers here, though the whole process is complete mystery to us, is His arm shortened beyond? Surely He is equally able to do so there. And if it is irrational to pray for our fellow-men there, it is equally irrational to pray for them here in this Abbey. The common pulsation of the life of God through them and through us constitutes the link between us there as it does here, and I cannot but believe that they are very near to us, nay, in a sense nearer than ever they were when they were in the restrictions of the flesh, and that they are affected by our conduct, and by our condition.

"What else do those words mean which we shall shortly listen to in the Anthem revealing the motherliness of the Omnipotent? What do they mean? Why does He wipe away their tears? Is it conceivable that there are tears in Paradise? Why there is joy in Paradise, we are told, when sinners repent, and therefore will there not be sorrow in Paradise when sinners are hardened? There must be a thrill of sympathy between us and them. Why the ascertained facts of physical science are tending ever more and

more in the direction of breaking down the supposed antagonism between mind and matter—between the natural and the supernatural, and ever more and more indicating that the communion of saints is probably not so much a theological expression as a natural law. For it is rapidly being demonstrated that mind can act on mind, independently of the recognized channels of sensation. You may call it what you will — mind-transference, telepathy, or dynamic thinking—it is a fact, that in some circumstances, mind can influence mind without contact and without even proximity. Tennyson, our poet-prophet, says in 'Aylmer's Field'—

> 'Star to star vibrates light: may soul to soul
> Strike through a finer element of her own?'

Let the believer in the communion of saints reverently, determinedly, concentrate thought upon one who is now in the spirit world—one perhaps, whose judgment on earth he eagerly followed, not seeking that species of intercourse which encourages messages spelt by raps and knocks, but by the projection of the mind into space external to itself, seeking at the same time reverent communion with the Divine Spirit, and who shall deny the probability that the loved one we seek, whose affections are expanding in the fuller, freer light beyond the grave, can pour into our minds a stream of guiding spiritual influence? We are surrounded, S. Paul says, by an innumerable cloud of witnesses. Among them are some of our closest and dearest—the mother who bore us, the father who taught us by his forbearing love what the love of God must be. Would they not cheer, encourage, console us if they could? Must they not grieve when we are hard, worldly, prayerless, impure,

unchristlike? And then perhaps their Father and our Father wipes away metaphorically their tears. I do not know how. Possibly by the assurance that, as they have fought and conquered, so shall we, though we look far from it now; that

'If they wait a little longer
In uncomplaining love,
His own most gracious smile
Shall welcome us above.'

"And thus is the communion of saints, the common divine life that death is powerless to sunder, a truth that should awaken us to the dignity and blessedness of life, lift us into the sphere of eternal reality, help us to live to God earnestly, consciously, willingly, repentantly, for our home is with God and our citizenship is in Heaven.

"There is one short lesson in the realm of matter. The doctrine of the communion of saints ought to influence mightily our conduct towards our fellow-men. The Roman Church has separated All Saints from All Souls. Though we preserve as a black letter saints' day All Souls, we have united the two in the Festival of All Saints.

"And I should not be doing my duty if I ceased without emphasizing one important truth in connection with the communion of saints. Without the slightest doubt the perpetual witness, the peculiar focus for it, the manifestation in time's relations of the eternal truth, the certificated channel of the communion of saints in all its aspects, is the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. Apart from this doctrine, much of the language of the Communion Service is mere unmeaning verbiage. It is the authorized ceremony in the due performance of which the world of sense and the world of spirit touch and blend and overflow the one into the other.

It is mere illogical rationalism to say, 'How can these things be?'" (Printed in "The Family Churchman" for Nov. 8th, 1895).

(2) From a speech by the Very Reverend Dr. Luckock, Dean of Lichfield.

"Canon Liddon, in 1879, wrote to me these words:—

"'It is strange indeed that people will go on constantly appealing to the authority of the Primitive Church, and yet ignore, if they do not deny, the fact that prayers for the faithful dead were as much a part of the Church's life—public us well as private—as even the worship of our Blessed Lord, much more so than our recognition of certain portions of the Canon of the New Testament.'

"An Objection.

"How is this argument from the authority of the Primitive Church met by the Protestant controversalist of the present day? He forgets the example of the Reformers—whom he quotes when it is convenient, and he does not appeal to the Scriptures as they were interpreted by the Primitive Christian Fathers; but to the Scriptures alone as he himself thinks fit to read them. Just because there is no direct evidence in so many words in Holy Scripture enjoining prayers for the dead, he maintains that as members of the Reformed Church, believing Scripture and Scripture alone, we have no right to revive them. I want to point out to you what inconsistency is involved in this position. Take the case of Sunday as an illustration. There is not a single text in the whole Bible which teaches us in so many words that the seventh day was to be superseded by the first. It is perfectly true that in the New Testament we find religious associations connected with the first day. But if

there was a single text directing the change we should not have found in certain portions of the Church in the early centuries both the seventh and the first day observed. In justifying the change, we appeal to the Primitive Church, being perfectly certain that the rulers and Bishops of the Church would never have sanctioned such a revolution as that unless they had received by tradition such direction as they believed to have come from our Blessed Lord Himself. What, then, is the rule of authority in the one case must be made the rule in the other.

"Another Objection.

"Continuing, the Dean of Lichfield noticed another objection — that they were members of the Reformed Church; and that the Reformed Church condemned prayers for the dead. In answer, he said, it was true that individual fanatics might have obscured and over-shadowed the practice of prayers for the faithful departed, but that the Church in its corporate capacity ever passed anything like a real condemnation on this practice he absolutely denied. It was not generally known that in the original draft of the *Forty-two* Articles, 'prayers for the dead' were included (in Article XXIII.) in a list of practices said to be 'repugnant to the Word of God.' But when these Articles were submitted to Convocation, when the Church in her corporate capacity was asked to sanction this Article, the words 'prayers for the dead' were erased, and they never afterwards appeared in the authorised edition of the Forty-two Articles.

"Then they were asked what was the good of prayers for the dead? They certainly were not told in Scripture what was the exact benefit which would accrue to the departed from the prayers of the living. What, then, were they to

do? Just what they did before—throw themselves on the teaching of the Primitive Church. There was not a single ancient liturgy in which there were not some such prayers. The Church of early times prayed for increase of peace, and light, and rest, and refreshment in Paradise, for a speedy resurrection; for the effacement of those spots and stains which sin leaves on the soul; prayed that by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit the souls of the departed might be made meet, more meet for the inheritance of the Saints in light and the enjoyment of the beatific vision."

Another reference to the use of prayers for the departed is in the wording of monuments over dead folk, and the "Hierugia Anglicana" gives a list and quotations from thirty-five Post-Reformation Epitaphs, of dates ranging from 1547 to 1782.

(1671.) In the Episcopal Chapel of Bishop Auckland, County Durham, there is the monument to the famous Bishop Cosin: "In non morituram memoriam Johannis Cosin, Episcopi Dunelmensis, qui hoc sacellum construxit, ornavit, et *Deo* consecravit, an. *Domini* MDCLXV. in Festo S. Petri. Obiit XV. die mensis Januarii, anno *Domini* MDCLXXI. et hic sepultus est, expectans felicem corporis sui resurrectionem, ac vitam in coelis eternam. *Requiescat in pace.*"

(1680.) The Cathedral of S. Asaph has the monument of Bishop Barrow, the epitaph of which (so it is said) was composed by himself: "Exuviæ Isaaci (Barrow) Asaphensis Episcopi in manum *Domini* depositæ, in spem lætæ resurrectionis per sola *Christi* merita. Oves transeuntes in domum *Domini* orationis, orate pro conservo vestro, ut inveniat misericordiam in die *Domini*."

Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, places before us in so beautiful

a manner the rationale of the state of the faithful departed that we here quote from him, though the following paragraph does not speak of prayers for the departed, and we invite the reader to take it in conjunction with the words of "Bishop" Martensen quoted below.

"The very theory of the morality of the Gospel, the notion that justification and sanctification are real, though in the individual often imperfect processes, the belief that salvation depends on obedience, conduct us to this thought, that the work of Christ in us whereby we are saved being individually imperfect, in view of our insufficient co-operation with it, shall continue to work in us, so that at the Day of Judgment we may be found pure in Him; that having had grace to keep the Law of God, and having failed to do so, yet having died in His faith and fear, God will carry on the process of our being made fit for Heaven, not by the gift of fresh grace, but by the same purifying process of adversity whereby He fines our souls in this life. We know that we have in us passive bad habits, unheavenly tastes, which the soul contracts through sin, and which remain after the guilt of sin is remitted, and that these must be removed before our entrance into Heaven, into which nothing that is impure or imperfect may enter. S. Macarius thought that these were removed by God in an instant. The same has been held by very thoughtful minds, who yet had a deep perception of the holiness of God's love. Others may think it more probable that God removes the stain gradually, as it was gradually contracted, and that man's cleansing after death will bear some relation to his cleansing in this life, as S. Augustine often suggests. Only as regards the eternal condition, as the tree has fallen, so will it lie; and the eternal distinction between the lost and saved is not con-

fused by the process. But not only is this thought a source of comfort in view of such as we have mentioned (the careless and worldly), it is also fraught with unspeakable consolation in the case of all those who try to do their duty, and who put their whole trust in their Lord's Passion, and yet are conscious of many shortcomings, of want of depth and reality in their contrition. To such, the idea that after death, although they will have no choice of their own, they will be so conformed to the just will of God, that they may joyfully endure that which is to prepare them for the eternal vision and fruition of Him Whom, in their poor way, they love above all things, is not only not appalling, however terrible, but actually conducive to holy peace. That true humility which ever seeketh the lowest room will extend beyond the grave; and to bear the indignation of the Lord because one has sinned against Him is a disposition of soul well-pleasing to Him."

Dean Farrar, too, in his "Mercy and Judgment," testifies to the universality of prayers for the departed: "That there is an Intermediate State all her (*i.e.*, the Church of England's) best divines would admit, and also that prayer for the dead was an ancient and almost universal practice." And: "As regards prayers for the dead, it is unanimously admitted that they existed in the Jewish Church, and were unreproved by our Lord. It is also admitted that to pray for the dead was a very ancient custom in the Christian Church. It is mentioned with approval by Tertullian in the second century, and by Origen, Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others, the common opinion being that of S. Augustine, that 'the souls of the dead are relieved by the devotion of the living.' It is, however, quite clear that these prayers were considered by

the majority, when they spoke with precision, to affect the condition of none but the *faithful dead*." Dean Farrar is careful to use the word "faithful dead."

We must not let it be supposed that "another chance will be given" necessarily. We hold with S. Clement of Rome: "After we leave this world we are no longer able to confess sin and to turn from it"—*οὐκ ἔτι δυνάμεθα ἐκεῖ ἐξομολήσασθαι ἢ μετανοεῖν ἔτι* (Ep. II.). So also Cyprian, Augustine, etc.

For an error had at one time been started that everyone would eventually be saved. The influence of the Alexandrian School, through Origen and Clement of Alexandria, had suggested a general restitution of all souls, even of Satan; but this view was not generally held.

In the year of Dr. Pusey's death (Sept., 1882), an incumbent in Leicester gave notice that on the day of the great theologian's funeral, there would be a Celebration of the Holy Eucharist with special intention of praying for the soul of the departed Saint—the exact wording has escaped our memory.

Certain persons wrote in complaint to Dr. Magee, at that time Bishop of Peterborough, who replied in some such words as these: "That certainly the Early Church and Fathers advocated prayers for the departed, and the Church of England could hardly afford to throw over such authorities." These are not the exact words, but we believe they contain the sense of the Bishop's reply.

That great philanthropist the noble Lord Shaftesbury (d. 1885), "Peer and costermonger," who described himself as "an Evangelical of the Evangelicals," could write in his diary, in relation to a friend departed: "The Lord rest his soul." Commemorating his wife and daughter who had

gone before, he said: "And, O God, may I pray that our other blessed and pious children *gone before us*, Francis, Maurice, and Mary, may be with us."

But reference made to a legal judgment may appeal more to some people than universal tradition and practice.

The case of Breeks *v.* Woolfrey took place in the Court of Arches, in 1838. The alleged offence was asserted to have been committed in the diocese of Winchester, by the cutting of a tombstone with these words—from 2 Maccabees xii. 26: "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead." "*Pray for the soul of J. Woolfrey*"; this tombstone is in the churchyard of Carisbrook, I.W.

The promoter of the suit alleged that this inscription—on the principle of prayers for the departed being illegal—was contrary to (1) The Articles, (2) The Canons, (3) The Constitutions of the Church of England; as opposed likewise to her (1) Doctrine, and (2) her Discipline.

The President of the Court, Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, delivered the following judgment: "I am of opinion that the offence imputed by the Articles has not been sustained; that no authority or Canon has been pointed out by which the practice of praying for the dead has been expressly prohibited; and I am accordingly of opinion, that if the Articles were proved, the facts would not subject the party to ecclesiastical censure, as far as regards the illegality of the inscription on the tombstone."

But a Protestant may point out that in the third part of the Homily (No. 7), "Concerning Prayer," suffrages for the departed are spoken of as being useless. The President of the Court made some remarks thereon, which we place before our readers: "If it had been the intention of the Church to have forbidden the practice,

surely there would have been an express and distinct prohibition of it. In looking to the Homily, it must be considered what was the purpose for which it was composed —viz., to discourage the practice of praying for the dead as connected with the doctrine of Purgatory, but in no part of the Homily is it declared that the practice of praying for the dead is unlawful—merely that it is useless; that prayers for the dead could have no effect in altering the condition of the dead, and that in the Word of God we have no commandment to do so; and referring to S. Chrysostom and S. Cyprian, it is said: 'Let these and other such places be sufficient to take away the gross error of Purgatory out of their heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers.' It seemed clearly to have been the intention of the composer of the Homily to discourage the practice of praying for the dead; but it does not appear that in any part of the Homily he declares the practice to be an unlawful one. But supposing he had been of opinion that such prayers were unlawful, it is not necessarily to be inferred that the Church of England adopted every part of the doctrines contained in the Homilies. If it had been the opinion of the framers of the Articles and Canons of the Church that prayers for the dead were opposed to the Scriptures, they would have expressly declared their illegality. On this part of the case, then, I am of opinion that there has been no violation of any of the Articles of the Church. No other Articles have been referred to specifically to make out the proposition that the Church considered prayers for the dead an illegal practice."

The Protestant—whether within or without the Church—cannot in the slightest degree grasp the idea of praying for

the departed, for he has practically given up the doctrine of an Intermediate State, professing to believe that a good man "goes full-sail into Heaven"—as we once heard in a sermon delivered by a preacher well-known in his own day—while the wicked go with equal promptitude to Gehenna—and with which former opinion the Roman agrees in certain extreme and rare cases, *i.e.*, with respect to "Saints."

No one can sensibly discuss this subject unless he first know something of the principle of prayers for the faithful departed. All testimony, all quotations, primitive and continuous to our own time, are deemed useless by the "Protestant." As we have said already, he claims the right and power of interpreting any verse in the Bible, and as he never permits himself to suppose that his interpretation can by any possibility be erroneous, he basks in the comfortable and self-satisying refuge of an infallible Pope—himself—to whom he can always refer.

But we write chiefly for fellow members of that Church which—claiming her primitive foundation and the continuation within her fold of the "faith once for all delivered unto the Saints," and deeply lamenting her own shortcomings—in truth and love, appeals to the history of the Universal Church.

But it is sometimes helpful to bring forward the favourable opinions of others, opponents, whether real or imaginary. As the Church of England claims to be the Catholic Church of this country we naturally turn to Protestant sects wherein to find such adversaries.

John Wesley in one of his manuscripts—to which we may ascribe the date, approximately, of 1741—declares that he considered it his duty "to pray for the faithful departed"; he maintained that the practice was ancient, orthodox,

justifiable, of "the earliest antiquity, and the Church of England."

The pious Richard Baxter, a Puritan of the Puritans, "the coryphœus of ancient Puritanism" (N.B.—"Richard Baxter on the Sacraments, Holy Orders, Holy Baptism, Confirmation, Absolution." Pub. by James Parker and Co., 1800), wrote thus :—

"Bishop Usher hath copiously proved that they were saints, supposed to be in Heaven, or Paradise, and not in Purgatory, that were then prayed for . . . and therefore their prayers then were . . . the petitioning of all those following mercies which are not to be received till the resurrection. Now, we are far from being of another Church, or religion, than those who hold such an opinion as this. . . . You see, then, that our question is not whether the dead may be prayed for, but what prayers may be made for them."

"Protestants" admire Luther—as we all may, for his bravery in belling the cat—even those who take a far lower view than he did of the Sacraments, etc.

Let us see what one of the most learned and conservative of the Lutheran body—"Bishop" Martensen, of Seeland, in Denmark (1808-1884)—says as to the Intermediate State, the necessity of progress therein, and the consequent naturalness and validity of prayers for the departed :—

"Neither in Holy Scripture, nor in the conception of an Intermediate State, is there any foundation for the notion of a sleep of the soul (ψυχοπαννωχια) from the moment of death until the last day. As no soul leaves this present existence in a fully complete and prepared state, we must suppose that there is an Intermediate State, a realm of progressive development in which souls are prepared and

matured for the final judgment. Though the Romish doctrine of Purgatory is repudiated because it is mixed up with so many crude and false suppositions, it nevertheless contains this truth, that the Intermediate State must, in a purely spiritual sense, be a Purgatory, designed for the purifying of the soul. . . . The kingdom of the departed is not one of works and deeds, for—being spirits without material bodies—they no longer possess the conditions upon which works and deeds are possible. Nevertheless, they live a deep spiritual life."

Dr. Martensen proceeds to reflect how the outward scenes and influences smooth over the stern realities of this life, which, as it were, draw a veil over them, and that when this veil has been drawn away by death, and but one Voice strikes the soul, then the memory of past deeds comes into the soul—"Son, remember"; that these memories produce, as it were, a vision either black and terrible, or bright with joyous welcome :—to quote the exact words of this venerable author—"A vision which must be the source either of joy or of terror, because it presents to view the real and deepest truth of consciousness, which may be, not only comforting and bliss-giving, but a judging and condemning truth also.

"As, therefore, their works do thus follow departed spirits, they not only live and move in the elements of bliss or of woe which they have prepared for themselves in *time*, that is, in *this* life, but they continue to receive and work out a new state of consciousness, because they continue spiritually to mould and govern themselves in relation to the new manifestations of the Divine will, now for the first time presented to their view, and in this manner still to develop themselves until the last final judgment : . . . various regions thus necessarily present themselves in Hades, and

we must accordingly speak of Paradise and Hell as an Intermediate State. But none of these states can be considered to be fully and finally closed, for even the blessed have still an inner history, they still need a *purifying*, an *increase* and *growth* in *holiness* and *bliss*" (see "Clarke's Foreign Theological Library," 4th Series, Vol. XII., Ed. 1866).

However much we reject communion with the Lutheran Protestant body, as not possessing Orders and being impregnated with heresies, we can quite well go with them thus far, and with Dr. Martensen, as to the nature and line of the Lutheran Movement "in its original form."

"The Lutheran Reformation in its original form took a positive attitude towards both dogmatic and ritual *tradition* in so far as it was œcumenical tradition . . . that is, so far as it bore the mark of no particular Church, being neither Greek-Catholic nor Roman Catholic, but simply Catholic" ("Christian Dogmatics").

Dr. Martensen writes also of the Intermediate State as "a kingdom of calm thought and self-remembrance." These are the words of an "orthodox Protestant School," that is to say, which has preserved its tenets as they were in the sixteenth century, unlike the tenets held by the mass of Protestant sects of the present time, which Protestants have dissented from original Protestantism.

Dr. Newman, in one of his Oxford sermons, has something of the same vein of thought as Dr. Martensen; he speaks of the state of the faithful departed as "a school-time of *contemplation*, as this world is a discipline of active service."

And Dr. Martensen's words quoted above about the blessed dead undergoing "a purifying, an increase and growth in holiness and bliss" may recall to mind the words

of the celebrated Bishop Bull; in his sermon on The Future State he said that "it is the divine ordination and disposition that those who are saved should *per gradus proficere*—proceed by degrees or steps—to their perfect beatitude" (see p. 42).

With reference to German Protestants, Perrone said that Protestants admitted a Purgatory, or state of "expiation," which they call "a school of preparation." "If you mention Purgatory to any Protestant, he kindles up; but if you ask the same person, whether or no a state of expiation, 'expurgation,' or 'a school of preparation, expectation,' etc., can be admitted, he will readily grant it you; yea, sometimes he contends vehemently that such a state is to be admitted."

Having quoted several German authors on this side, Perrone continues: "All agree in saying, that it is too violent to admit at once into Heaven all those who repented of their past evil life only at the end, or who indulged too much in the sensualities of this life, since 'nothing defiled' enters there; also it is too harsh to assign all such to eternal torments."

Leibnitz also says in detail: "Almost all agree in a fatherly chastisement or purifying after this life (of whatsoever sort it be), which the souls themselves, on their departure from the body, being illumined, and seeing thoroughly the imperfection of their past life and the foulness of sin, touched with exceeding sorrow, invite to themselves willingly, and would not wish to attain in any other way to the summit of beatitude" (copied from Dr. Pusey's "What is of faith as to Everlasting Punishment?" pp. 119, 120).

In objecting to any idea, or any quality, of a Purgatory, English Protestants make use of Eccles. xi. 3: "In the place where the tree falleth, there it shall lie." But surely,

this may mean—that as the soul and spirit of a person leaves *this* world, so shall that soul and spirit find itself on its entrance into the next world, either in the same state of hope or of loss, of good or of evil; "the filthy shall be filthy still." There is nothing in the verse to show that progress—perhaps retrogression—may not fall to the lot of the departed person. The tree falls, and one of two things—at least—happens to it; it may be taken away from the spot where it fell, kept for a time to be seasoned, in order to render it fit for its office, according to the position it will occupy; then it is cut, carved, or polished, thus becoming by degrees a piece of furniture for a most stately house.

On the other hand, the tree may lie by the bank of the dark, rapidly-rolling river exactly where it fell, to become soft and rotten, until, one day, the farm labourers grub it up, and, chopping it to pieces, place it by degrees upon the fire kindled to burn rubbish.

We must not suppose that there is any other *probation* than that afforded in this life—at all events for ordinary Christians: "When thou art cut down by death, like a tree felled, then thou canst no longer bear fruit, but must lie in the same direction, and in the same condition, as that in which thou wast when hewn down by death" (Bishop Christopher Wordsworth).

A noteworthy movement is now in progress in the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland—one section of which is the claiming of liberty to "remember in prayer the faithful dead" (see "The Scottish Church Society," etc. Some Accounts of its Aims").

An appeal pathetic, and full of common sense, is made to the readers of "The Divine Liturgy" (Rivington, 1889), by its author, Dean Mortimer Luckock, of Lichfield:—

"In the full belief, then, that the practice is perfectly legitimate, we would gladly see a more frank and open recognition of it on historic grounds. While sects are starting into existence, and multiplying with amazing rapidity, and adopting any innovation in modes of worship that fancy prompts, it is no light claim to the respect of men that the Church of the nineteenth century should be able to exhibit the self-same features that were familiar to the Christians of the second and the third. Again, it would strengthen our position in the Roman controversy, and remove one of the main charges against the Church of the Reformation, viz., that she had cut herself adrift from the Church of the first age by abandoning a usage that entered so largely into primitive worship. But far above either of these objects or any others of a kindred nature there is the paramount aim of practical utility and spiritual help. We have been told that in one particular country the Missions of the Anglican Church have failed to lay hold of the natives because the messengers we had sent out had taught them that it was unlawful to pray for the departed. The natural instincts of a nation whose system of religious worship was bound up with the commemoration of the dead rebelled against such teaching. But while they closed their ears to the ministry which offered them nothing but the cold and chilling comfort of Protestant reserve, they were attracted by the Romish priests, who, to meet the natural craving of the people for closer union with the dead, pressed to the utmost their peculiar doctrine of Purgatory.

"The Church of England has long since paid the penalty for the admission of false doctrine. She has not indeed been deprived of all exercise of her rightful prerogative, for 'the main body and essentials' of divine worship have never

been sacrificed,* and enough was left at the Reformation just to witness to her retention of the principle. But for three centuries she has lost much of that free and open action which alone can make her prayers a real motive power in her life. It must be our anxious care in all efforts to recover her lost position, to adhere strictly to the ancient lines, and to use no petitions but such as echo the language of the Liturgies of the Early Church, and pray not for deliverance from purgatorial pains, but for the light, or rest, or refreshment of the faithful departed, for the effacement of their sinful stains and defilement, and for the fuller sanctification of those who are now in peace with Christ" (pp. 183-185).

To those who reject the idea of an intermediate spirit-world and state, where souls are endued with a conscious existence, we would add a few words. In the Middle Ages some ideas, varying in character, were spread abroad, of which ideas one was that between the moment of death and the general resurrection there was to the soul an absolute absence of consciousness, it simply *slept*. These "hypnopsychites," or "Psychopannychites," held the heretical view that the destruction of the bodily organs reduced the soul to a state of powerlessness. These views were maintained by the Anabaptists, against whom inveighed the Protestant Calvin in his work "Psychopamychia," published in 1534 (see also previous reference to this error on p. 30).

This long digression we have considered necessary in order to place before our readers the tests of the validity of prayers for the departed, because this Catholic practice was the primary excuse for the Roman and un-Catholic doctrine of "Purgatory," and its connected error of "Indulgences."

* *Cf.* Preface to Prayer Book, 1662 A.D.

The Jews, as is well known, offered prayers for the departed; we may assume that our Blessed Lord joined in all Jewish services, and He said nothing against the practice. The following chief memorial prayer is recited in the Synagogue on all festivals: "May God remember the soul of my honoured . . . who has departed to his rest, and I now solemnly offer charity* for his sake; may his soul enjoy eternal life with the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, and Leah, and the rest of the righteous males and females that are in Paradise, and let us say 'Amen.'"

Another prayer is as follows: "We beseech Thee to receive the soul of . . . who hath been gathered unto his people; have mercy upon him; pardon all his transgressions; remember unto him the righteousness which he wrought, and let his reward be with him, and his recompense before him. O shelter his soul under the shadow of Thy wings; make known to him the path of life; in Thy Presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore."

At the funeral of Prince Henry of Battenburg—buried at Whippingham, Isle of Wight—on Wednesday, 6th February, 1896, was sung an Anthem from the service of S. Chysostom: "Give rest, O Christ, to Thy servant with Thy Saints, where sorrow and pain are no more."

The widowed Princess placed upon the coffin a wreath, attached to which were two white streamers, on one of which were the words of prayer, primitive and Catholic: "Lord, all-pitying, Jesu Blest, grant him Thine eternal rest."

"A great many Protestants were very much surprised to

* "Charity," that is to say alms.

read in the *Times* of Thursday last that at the Royal funeral on the previous day, the following petition formed part of the Anthem sung in Whippingham Church: 'Give rest in Christ to Thy servant with Thy saints, where sorrow and pain are no more, neither sighing, but life everlasting.' This has certainly the appearance of prayer for the dead, though for the dead as in peace, not in Purgatory."

A paper called "The English Churchman"—under general circumstances a paradoxical title with respect to this journal—thus commented on the petition, carefully asserting that this, though it meant prayers for the departed, yet did not imply Purgatory; the fact being recognized that the former can be entertained without the latter, this recognition shows an advance in the science of eschatology within the Protestant mind, and is something to be really thankful for.

On March 27th, 1896, in connection with the funeral of Archdeacon Denison, a Celebration of the Holy Eucharist took place in S. Paul's Cathedral. "After the consecration, was sung, to a weird Russian setting, the following *Communion* taken from the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom. It will be remembered that it was used at the funeral of the late Prince Henry of Battenburg:—

"'Give rest, O Christ, to Thy servant with Thy saints, where sorrow and pain are no more, neither sighing, but life everlasting.

"'Thou only art immortal, the Creator and Maker of man; but we are mortal, formed of the earth, and unto earth shall we return: for so didst Thou ordain when Thou createdst me, saying, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." All we go down to the dust, and weeping o'er the tomb we make our song: Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!

"'Give rest, O Christ, to Thy servant with Thy saints, where sorrow and pain are no more, neither sighing, but life everlasting.'"

In September, 1896, the following remarks and correspondence appeared. We draw particular attention to those words of the Bishop's letter which we have put in italics:—

"'The English Churchman' publishes a correspondence between Mr. Fredrick Heard, who resides at Bramah Road, North Brixton, and the Bishop of Rochester, with reference to a hymnal used at the Children's Services at S. Anne's, South Lambert Road. The book, it is stated, cannot be purchased, and is marked 'For private circulation only.' Mr. Heard copied out and comments on the following lines—

'May we ever more and more
In the Sacrament adore
Thee the *God* we bow before,
Hear us, we beseech Thee.'

'Mary, dearest Mother, Israel's Lily hail!
Pattern for Christ's children in this sinful vale.'

'Grant him, Lord, eternal rest,
With the spirits of the blest.'

"The first is assuredly idolatrous, for adoring a piece of bread is sinful and is idolatry, and referring to it as 'God' is condemned by the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles of Religion. The next, being Mary-worship, is strictly forbidden by the Homilies. The latter is indicative of Purgatory, which the Articles of Religion describe as 'a fond thing vainly invented.'

"Mr. Heard also complains that—

"'At this Church, on the Holy Table, are candle and cross, and on the walls are pictures of the Blessed Virgin

Mary. The eastward position is taken, and vestments are worn; all these being, as your Lordship is aware, illegal in the Church of England.'

"*The Bishop of Rochester* replied—

"'If you could get a few words of quiet conversation with the excellent and hard-working Vicar of S. Anne's, you will find, I am sure, that he does not adore bread, nor worship the Blessed Virgin, nor, *because he prays (as Christians of nearly all times and places have done) for the dead, does he believe in Purgatory in a Roman sense.* I would strongly advise (if you are really careful about the matter) your talking to him.'

"*Mr. Heard* next wrote that he had seen the Vicar, the Rev. W. A. Morris, who informed him that 'he heartily believed in the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist and the Real Presence.' Mr. Heard then goes on to complain of acts of 'adoration' during the Holy Communion, and adds—

"'Your Lordship remarks in your letter that it has been the custom of almost every Christian Church to pray for the dead. But this does not include the Church of England, for the practice is condemned by her Homilies, and also one would imagine that if the Church of England sanctioned prayers for the departed, such prayers would be contained in her Liturgy, and as every clergyman in the Church of England is bound not to preach other than is contained in the Word of God, the man who teaches such un-Scriptural, Pagan, and sinful doctrines as "Intercession of Saints," "Real Presence," "Prayers for the Dead," and other remnants of Rome, has clearly no right to remain in the English Church. . . . If your Lordship will kindly inform me the reason for prayers for the dead and its Scriptural warranty, I shall be very grateful.'

"The *Bishop's* reply was as follows—

"'In regard to your letter of the 4th (August), I learn from Mr. Morris that he has offered you a further interview on his return. I hope you will talk matters over with him, if you are pursuing them in real inquiry, and not for mere controversy's sake. Dr. Maclear's new *Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles* may in the former case be of service to you.'"

Archbishop Temple has said: "In our private prayers there is nothing in the Church of England teaching to forbid our prayers for those we love, and who are gone before us; but in our public worship there is need of that kind of reverence which restrains the language, and which perpetually acknowledges our own ignorance — our own ignorance both as to what is happening in the world of spirit, and our ignorance of how God will bring to a completion the work which He has begun in Christian souls."

We conclude this chapter and these notes with some quotations from writers of the Eastern Church.

"We know that when any one of us falls, he falls alone, but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her, and in unity with all her other members. If any one believes, he is in the communion of faith; if he loves, he is in the communion of love; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer. Wherefore no one can rest his hope on his own prayers, and every one who prays asks the whole Church for intercession, not as if he had doubts of the intercession of Christ, the one Advocate, but in the assurance that the whole Church ever prays for all her members. All the Angels pray for us, the Apostles, Martyrs, and Patriarchs, and above them all the Mother of our Lord, and this holy unity is the true life of the Church. But if the Church, visible and invisible, prays without ceasing,

why do we ask her for her prayers? Do we not entreat mercy of God and Christ, although His mercy preventeth our prayer? The very reason that we ask the Church for her prayers is that we know that she gives the assistance of her intercession even to him that does not ask for it, and to him that asks she gives it in far greater measure than he asks—for in her is the fulness of the Spirit of God. Thus we glorify all whom God has glorified and is glorifying; for how should we say that Christ is living within us, if we do not make ourselves like unto Christ? Wherefore we glorify the Saints, the Angels, and the Prophets, and more than all the most pure Mother of the Lord Jesus, not acknowledging her either to have been conceived without sin, or to have been perfect (for Christ alone is without sin and perfect), but remembering that the pre-eminence, passing all understanding, which she has above all God's creatures, was borne witness to by the Angel and by Elizabeth, and above all by the Saviour Himself, when He appointed John, His great Apostle and seer of mysteries, to fulfil the duties of a son and to serve her. Just as each of us requires prayers from all, so each person owes his prayers on behalf of all, the living and the dead, and even those who are as yet unborn; for in praying as we do with all the Church, that the world may come to the knowledge of God, we pray not only for the present generation, but for those whom God will hereafter call into life. We pray for the living that the grace of God may be upon them, and for *the dead that they may become worthy of the vision of God's face. We know nothing of an Intermediate State of souls, which have neither been received into the Kingdom of God, nor condemned to torture, for of such a state we have received no teaching, either from the Apostles or from Christ; we do not acknowledge Purga-*

tory, that is the purification of souls by sufferings from which they may be redeemed by their own works or those of others; for the Church knows nothing of salvation by outward means, nor any sufferings, whatever they may be, except those of Christ; nor of bargaining with God, as in the case of a man buying himself off by good works.

"All such heathenism as this remains with the inheritors of the wisdom of the heathen, with those who pride themselves of place, or name, or in territorial dominion, and who have instituted an eighth Sacrament of dead faith. But we pray in the spirit of love, knowing that no one will be saved otherwise than by the prayer of all the Church, in which Christ lives, knowing and trusting that so long as the end of time has not come, all the members of the Church, both living and departed, are being perfected incessantly by mutual prayer.

"The Saints whom God has glorified are much higher than we, but higher than all is the Holy Church, which comprises within herself all the Saints, and prays for all, as may be seen in the divinely inspired Liturgy. In her prayer our prayer is also heard, however unworthy we may be to be called sons of the Church. If, while worshipping and glorifying the Saints, we pray that God may glorify them, we do not lay ourselves open to the charge of pride; for to us who have received permission to call God 'Our Father,' leave has also been granted to pray, 'Hallowed be His Name, His Kingdom come, His Will be done.' And if we are permitted to pray of God that He will glorify His Name, and accomplish His Will, who will forbid us to pray Him to glorify His Saints, and to give repose to His elect? For those indeed who are not of the elect we do not pray, just as Christ prayed not for the whole

world, but for those whom the Lord had given unto Him (S. John xvii.).

"Let no one say: 'What prayer shall I apportion for the living or the departed, when my prayers are insufficient even for myself?' For if he is not able to pray, of what use would it be to pray even for himself? But in truth the spirit of love prays in him. Likewise let him not say: 'What is the good of my prayer for another, when he prays for himself, and Christ Himself intercedes for him?' When a man prays, it is the spirit of love which prays within him. Let him not say: 'It is even now impossible, to change the judgment of God,' for his prayer itself is included in the ways of God, and God foresaw it. If he be a member of the Church his prayer is necessary for all her members. If the hand should say, that it did not require blood from the rest of the body, and that it would not give its own blood to it, the hand would wither. So a man is also necessary to the Church, as long as he is in her; and if he withdraws himself from communion with her, he perishes himself and will cease to be any longer a member of the Church. The Church prays for all, and we pray together for all; but our prayer must be true, and a true expression of love, and not a mere form of words. Not being able to love all men, we pray for those whom we love, and our prayer is not hypocritical; but we pray God, that we may be able to love all, and pray for all without hypocrisy. Mutual prayer is the blood of the Church, and the glorification of God her breath. We pray in a spirit of love, not of interest, in the spirit of filial freedom, not of the law of the hireling demanding his pay. Every man who asks: 'What use is there in prayer?' acknowledges himself to be in bondage. True prayer is true love" (Mr.

Khomiakoff's "Essay on the Church," in "Russia and the English Church," pp. 216-219, by Mr. Birkbeck).

Quotations have been given from Eastern Liturgies showing that the idea of an Intermediate State and the use of prayers for the departed are proved to have existed at a very early date.

We now add a few lines taken from "The Doctrine of the Russian Church" (Blackmore's translation), showing the view held in that communion:—

"*Q.* In what state are the souls of the dead till the general resurrection?

"*A.* The souls of the righteous are in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness; but the souls of the wicked are in a state the reverse of this.

"*Q.* Why may we not ascribe to the souls of the righteous perfect happiness immediately after death?

"*A.* Because it is ordained that the perfect retribution according to works shall be received by the perfect man after the resurrection of the body and God's last judgment.

"The Apostle Paul says: 'Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing' (2 Tim. iv. 8). And again: 'We must all appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad' (2 Cor. v. 10).

"*Q.* Why do we ascribe to the souls of the righteous a foretaste of bliss before the last judgment?

"*A.* On the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself, Who says in the parable that the righteous Lazarus was immediately after death carried into Abraham's bosom (S. Luke xvi. 22).

"*Q.* Is this foretaste of bliss joined with a sight of Christ's own Countenance?

"*A.* It is so more especially with the Saints, as we are given to understand by the Apostle Paul, who had a desire to depart, and be with Christ (Phil. i. 23).

"*Q.* What is to be remarked of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance?

"*A.* This: that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered on their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the Bloodless Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory.

"*Q.* On what is this doctrine founded?

"*A.* On the constant tradition of the Catholic Church, the sources of which may be seen even in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Maccabæus offered sacrifice for his men that had fallen (2 Macc. xii. 43). Prayer for the departed has ever formed a fixed part of the Divine Liturgy, from the first Liturgy of the Apostle James. S. Cyril of Jerusalem says: 'Very great will be the benefit to those souls, for which prayer is offered at the moment, when the holy and tremendous Sacrifice is lying in view' ('Lect. Mys.,' V. 9).

"S. Basil the Great, in his prayers for Pentecost, says that the Lord vouchsafes to receive from us propitiatory prayers and sacrifices *for those that are kept in Hades*, and allows us the hope of obtaining for them *peace*, *relief*, *freedom*" (see pp. 98-100).

In the third and fourth questions and answers just quoted we see the subject treated of which refers to the state of the departed Saints, and S. Paul is quoted. Of this subject thus

writes Dean Luckock concerning the "Beatific Vision": "In another vision (Rev. vii. 14, 15) S. John sees those 'which came out of great tribulation,' and 'they are before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple.' Apart from the consideration that this is taken from a distinct prophecy of the Church in its glorified state, it has been shown by a comparison of the Temple at Jerusalem, from which the imagery is taken, that the throne, which was the ark of the Covenant overshadowed by the Cherubim, was not seen by those who worshipped without in the Court.

"From all this it is clear that the Fathers and Doctors of the Early Church were right in their conclusion, that the souls of the Saints, whether Martyrs or others, will not see God and be admitted to the Beatific Vision till after the day of judgment. It follows, also, that the *perfect* knowledge of which S. Paul spoke must be still in the future, and dependent on the same manifestation" ("After Death," p. 227).

At the Reunion Conference held at Bonn in 1874, the subject of prayers for the departed was treated in the following manner:—

"*Döllinger:* The next thesis is as follows: 'We acknowledge that the practice of the commemoration of the faithful departed, *i.e.*, the calling down of a richer outpouring of Christ's grace upon them, has come down to us from the Primitive Church, and is to be preserved in the Church.'

"*Janyschew* and *Tatschaloff:* Agreed.

"*Bishop of Pittsburgh:* There is no doubt that the Primitive Church commemorated the faithful departed in this manner, and when we pray, 'Thy Kingdom come,' we do not exclude from that Kingdom those who have entered into everlasting rest.

"*Howson:* I would rather not vote on this article; not because I dispute that prayer for the dead is a practice of the Primitive Church, but only in consideration of the mischievous abuses to which the practice has given rise in times past. The English Church is silent concerning this practice, and I would be silent too.

"*Liddon:* The thesis is quite correct. No practice of the first three centuries is more clearly established than that of prayer for the dead. The English Church is silent on the subject, because at the time of the Reformation the doctrine of Purgatory had given rise to great abuses. But *usum non tollit abusus.* The proposed thesis contains the genuine substance of the doctrine of the Primitive Church. Dr. Pusey would highly disapprove if I did not assent to it.

"*Döllinger:* Our thesis is intended to rectify abuses by an accurate statement of the meaning of prayer for the dead.

"*Bishop of Pittsburgh:* The American Church is also silent as to this practice in her formularies, and I think her silence is wise; but I cannot doubt the truth of the thesis.

"*Trinder:* The faithful departed are commemorated in the Book of Common Prayer, when we pray in the Communion Service that we and all the whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of Christ's Passion. The faithful departed are included in the 'whole Church.'

"*Hogg:* The thesis should be submitted for amendment to the Committee that is to be formed for the consideration of the *Filioque.* In its present form it does not express with sufficient clearness the idea that it has in view.

"*Nevin:* No one has spoken against it except the Dean of Chester, and he does not dispute the truth, but only the opportuneness of the thesis.

"*Döllinger:* Perhaps Dr. Howson may have an amendment to suggest?

"*Howson:* No; I cannot frame the thesis better, nor indeed do I disapprove of it. I only beg to be excused from voting on account of a private scruple of my own.

"The thesis was accepted by a large majority" (pp. 62-65 of the Report of the Conference. Rivingtons, pub. 1875).

Of course, at these meetings those members of various bodies who spoke or consented did not officially represent those bodies; we cannot say that Dean Howson or Dr. Liddon represented the Anglican Communion, nor that Doctors Janyschew and Sukliotin possessed any representative quality for the Russian Church, but we may assume that the expressions of these various persons represented truly the views held officially by their respective denominations.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning Purgatory.

IN the Council of Trent the care of composing the Decree on Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, and Worship of them, Veneration of Relics and Images, was allotted to the Cardinal of Varmia and eight other Bishops, "who, although they all resolved not to move any difficulties, yet they did not agree. The Archbishop of Lanciano said that in handling the Mass mention was made that the Sacrifice is offered for those that are deceased in Christ *not entirely purged*, by which words the doctrine of Purgatory was sufficiently defined, so that nothing remained to be done but to enjoin the Bishops to cause it to be preached, and to take away the abuses, taking care also that there be no want of due prayers for the dead: and so the Decree was made" (Sarpi).

On the surface, nothing contrary to our opinion is visible—supposing that the words "*not entirely purged*" mean only that the souls of the faithful are in need of a progress in spiritual perception and ever-advancing holiness, agreeing with "Bishop" Martensen that the Intermediate State is

a realm of progressive development in which souls are prepared and matured for the final judgment.

The Decree likewise prohibited "curiosities," superstition, and dishonest gains.

"Purgatory" necessarily includes prayers for the departed, but such prayers do not necessarily include the Romish doctrine of Purgatory—nay, the forms and wording of many such prayers are an argument against such doctrine—of which last point we shall presently treat.

This portion of the argument being near to the conclusion of "Prayers for the Departed," and at the beginning of "Purgatory," we venture to think that we cannot do better at this point than quote a well-known Anglican divine.

He asks the question, "What was the primary intention of these prayers for the departed? They were first of all words of praise and thanksgiving for the blessed estate of the deceased, whereunto were afterwards added prayers and petitions that God would be pleased to forgive him his sins, to keep him from Hell, and to place him in the Kingdom of Heaven."

The learned divine then proceeds to state that these prayers were resolved into corrupt principle, and promulgated erroneous views, "especially when they began once to be applied not only to the good but to evil livers also, unto whom" (the latter), "by the first institution, they were never intended."

He traces the error referred to in the article as the "Doctrina Romanensium" of Purgatory as starting from a private exposition of S. Augustine, who said that the oblations and alms usually offered in the Churches "for all the dead that have received Baptism were thanksgiving for such as were very good, propitiations for such as were not very bad, but for such as were very evil, although they were

no helps for the dead, yet they were some kind of consolation for the living."

The divine then shows that prayers for the departed in the Primitive Liturgy of S. James of Jerusalem, and in the Roman Missal of his time (1581-1656), were considered to be for those that *were at peace resting in hope*, and therein nothing can be interpreted into a suggestion that the souls *are in torment*. He shows the subtle way in which changes in principle took place by quoting for us the instance in which a prayer for the soul of "Thy servant Leo" has suffered a change, and been transformed into, "Grant unto us, O Lord, that by the intercession of Thy servant Leo this oblation may profit us."

A simple example we have shown in our remarks elsewhere on the Uniat Armenian Church.

We must understand that by the words "Romish doctrine" is not intended any document of the Council of Trent, for the Twenty-second Article condemning such was produced in February, 1563, and the Tridentine Decree did not appear until December, 1563. "By the 'Romish doctrine' is not meant the Tridentine doctrine because this Article was drawn up before the Decree of the Council of Trent. What *is* opposed is *the received doctrine of the day* and unhappily of *this day too* or the *doctrine of the Roman Schools*" (Dr. Newman).

At the beginning of this article we have said something of "scholasticorum doctrina" and of the "doctrina Romanensium." It should be noticed that the term "Roman" may imply, or even include, Catholicism, whereas the termination "ish" often possesses an idea of something objectionable. For instance, "childish" suggests a weak or silly characteristic, whereas we should try to be "childlike";

this must not be pressed. But it is certain that as early as 1520 the names of Romanenses and Romanistæ were given to the extreme mediæval party, *i.e.*, thirteen years before the quarrel between Henry VIII. and the Bishop of Rome arose. Cranmer, in his "Answer to Gardiner," wrote: "Your new Romish errors." We have often in France heard the appellation "la partie Romaine" given to the ultramontane section of the Roman Communion.

Accepting as we do a Purgatory, that is an intermediate cleansing state, and knowing that the Romish doctrine goes far beyond us and primitive acceptance, we must seek out what Purgatory in the Romish sense really is.

The words of the Decree and Creed of the Council of Trent are: "There is a Purgatory, and the souls there detained are assisted by the prayers of the faithful, and particularly by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar."

As to the wording of this statement we venture to say that, as consistent members of the Church of England, we cannot object to it, but would include it within Archbishop Bramhall's statement that if the Romans would "abate us Transubstantiation" we should not find much wherein to disagree. So here, if all Roman doctrine of Purgatory were contained in the above declaration we might assent, for we have already quoted Primitive Liturgies, Early Fathers, and Anglican Divines to show that souls may be assisted by our prayers, especially by the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries.

But the examination of another document shows that it was the intention in reality to reaffirm the principle of the Council of Florence in 1443: "The truly penitent who have departed this life in the love of God before they have made satisfaction for their sins of commission and of

omission by fruits meet for repentance have their souls cleansed by *purgatorial pains* after death and for their relief *from these* the suffrages of the living, the Sacrifice of the Mass, etc., are helpful."

What the Greek-Catholic Church thought of these statements we will speak of lower down. There is the Creed of Pius V.—published in 1564;—in the Seventh Article of this exposition, we read: "I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are assisted by the prayers of the faithful." Cardinal Peronne (d. 1618) speaks gently of Purgatory: "By the word Purgatory we mean a state of expiation to endure for a time, in which . . . justified souls are detained."

But the other document to which we have referred expands such simple and acceptable statements (excluding that of the Council of Florence) into an error which at once shows the road to which the Romish school of thought was tending. This document is "The Catechism of the Council of Trent," published by order of Pius V., two years after his creed had been promulgated. In this, matters are set forth with the utmost clearness: "There is a Purgatorial fire, in which the *souls of the faithful* are *tormented* for a certain time and cleansed"—in order that they may be fitted for that state and place into which can enter nothing that is defiled.

The wording of the Council's Canons and Decrees, and that of the Catechism of the Tridentine Council we now place side by side for a more easy comparison.

It should be remembered that the Catechism was intended for the use of the pastors, a "prescribed form of delivering the faith and instructing Christians unto all the duties of piety."

"Sessio Vigesima Quinta.

Quæ est nona et ultima sub Pio IV., Pont. Max.

Cœpta die III, absoluta die IV decembr. M.D.LXIII.

Decretum de Purgatorio.

"Cum catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu sancto edocta, ex sacris Litteris et antiqua Patrum traditione, in sacris conciliis, et novissime in hac œcumenica Synodo docuerit, *Purgatorium esse (1) animasque ibi detentas*, fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili Altaris sacrificio juvari; præcipit sancta Synodus episcopis, ut sanam de Purgatorio doctrinam, a sanctis Patribus (1) et sacris conciliis (2) traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari diligenter studeant. Apud rudem vero plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores quæstiones, quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt (3), et ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, a popularibus concionibus secludantur. Incerta item, vel quæ specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac

"Purgatorius ignis.

"V. Præterea est *purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur*, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur. Ac de hujus quidem doctrinæ veritate, quam et Scripturarum testimoniis, et apostolica traditione confirmatum esse sancta Concilia declarant, eo diligentius et sæpius parocho disserendum erit, quod in ea tempora incidimus, quibus homines sanam doctrinam non sustinent." (From "The Catechism," p. 61, pub. by J. Leroux, Jouby, et Socios, Paris, 1848).

tractari non permittant (4). Ea vero quæ ad curiositatem quamdam aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tanquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant. Curent autem episcopi ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynæ (5), aliaque pietatis opera quæ a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, secundum Ecclesiæ instituta pie et devote fiant; et quæ pro illis ex testatorum fundationibus, vel alia ratione debentur, non perfunctorie, sed a sacerdotibus, et ecclesiæ ministris, et aliis qui hoc præstare tenentur, diligenter et accurate persolvantur."

((1) C. Qualis, et seq. dist. 25.—(2) Conc. Florent. sess. ult. in fin.—(3) I Tim. 1.—(4) Conc. Lateran. sub Leone X. —(5) Infr. cap. 4 de Refor.)

(From pp. 324-5 of the edition of "J. Leroux, Jouby et Socios," pub. at Paris, 1848.)

In the Translation of the Catechism by Theodore Alois Buckley (1852), now lying before us, the sub-divisions (or

"questions") are differently divided. In the above Latin, the division is numbered 5, in Buckley the translation is under question 3, and the following is the translation: "There is also the fire of Purgatory, in which the *souls of the just are purified by punishment* for a stated time," etc. But this translation is a watering-down of the original Latin word "cruciatæ," *i.e.*, "tormented."

The Decree of the Tridentine Council—which Council professed to be Œcumenical—must be considered as binding on the conscience of every member of the Roman communion. Is the "Catechismus Concilii Tridentini Pii V. Pontificis Maximi" to be received, *must* it be accepted, as *de fide* and as void of error as the "Sacrosancti et Œcumenici Concilii Tridentini . . . Canones et Decreta"? If so, then the more expanded treatment of the subject in the Catechism is to teach us that the "excruciating tortures" of the justified must be accepted as part of the faith necessary to the attainment of everlasting life, and that the more gentle treatment of the subject in the Canons and Decrees of the Council are insufficient. If the Catechism need not be held as of equal value with the Council's Decree, to what extent must it be considered valuable, and was it issued by the Pope of Rome as Pope and that Infallible? Whatever difference may exist on this point all must agree that the teaching about the Romish doctrine of Purgatory is that it is a state "in which the souls of the faithful (or justified) are *tormented*." The words strike us with a mingled feeling of surprise and horror, and we turn—as our Church bids us—to the Primitive Catholic Church to see if such a doctrine can be shown to have been generally taught therein, and not only thus taught but believed in as a doctrine necessary to everlasting life, for our

Mother bids us ever hold as a precious heritage the safeguard of the Catholic tradition.

Such texts as "The fire shall try every man's work," "Thou shalt by no means come out hence till thou have paid the uttermost farthing," do the Early Fathers give us any comments on these, or on 1 Cor. iii. 12-15? We affirm that if prayers were at first offered up for safety from any fire *it was from that fire which was to purge us at the last Great Day*, through which even the most holy, according to some, would have to be tried, when the hay and stubble would be annihilated. We do not deny, even if we care not to formulate, an assent to the idea that there is a purging fire in the dreadful Day of General Assize. Even if we do assent to this we shall not fail to find ourselves in excellent company. We should be following the opinion of S. Hilary (d. 368), who affirms that all the righteous—including the Blessed Theotokos herself—will have to pass through the fire "in that day." S. Ambrose, of Milan (340-396), the vigorous writer, says: "We must all pass through the fire, whether it be John the Evangelist whom the Lord so loved . . . for he is in Paradise and not separated from Christ." And again, Origen (c. 200), not infrequently speaks of this Judgment fire, as for instance, that S. Peter and S. John will have to pass through it, yet immediately shall they hear the words: "When thou passest through the fire it shall not hurt thee." S. Clement, of Alexandria (c. 200), held much the same opinion. S. Basil (c. 360), speaks also of "the trial and judgment by fire."

S. Peter, in his Second Epistle, speaks of the conflagration of this world at the coming of our Lord the Judge. S. Paul speaks of the fire which shall try every man's work.

From discussions on these texts the subject enlarged itself. Down to the time of S. Augustine of Hippo (d. 430), the "fire had not been defined, but it was generally considered to be the fire of the last Great Day." *

As far as we can see, it was Gregory the Great who metamorphosed the generally received opinion by taking away the cleansing, purging fire from the Day of Judgment, and locating it in "Hades"—the unseen portion of human existence—and it is from this period that the idea of the tormenting flames in *Purgatory* became fixed in people's minds. This great man—born about 540, becoming Pope of Rome in 590, and dying in 640—is one of the four Great Fathers of the Western Church—and the Anglican Church considers them to be such, giving them place in the kalendar of her Book of Common Prayer. He indeed formulated ideas which have since become concreted in modern Roman theology, "de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium Purgatoriis ignis credendum est," but the opinion of even one such of the four Great Fathers is not necessarily allied to "Quod semper, quod ab omnibus," etc.

We venture then to assert that inasmuch as such prominent writers of the Primitive Church, excluding S. Gregory, as we have just quoted—not to make mention of others—speak of a purging fire at the Judgment Day, it by no means follows that reference to a "purgatorial fire" must of necessity imply the fire of "The Romish doctrine."

But further, certain Fathers positively denied and formally protested against the doctrine that such a state or place as that of Purgatory (in the modern Romish sense) exists in

* "Pain after this life, for many at least, in the Day of (whether particular or general) Judgment, is so laid down by S. Paul, that it is strange that any overlook it" (Dr. Pusey's "What is Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?" p. 104).

the next state of existence, *e.g.*, S. Gregory of Nazianzen in his Oration XVI.

The "Church Quarterly Review"—whose calm judgment and historical accuracy must be the excuse for the writer so frequently quoting it—in July, 1888, under the subject of "Future Retribution," speaks very simply and plainly in order to show the great revolution of thought caused by S. Gregory having placed the purgatorial fire in Hades. From his time onwards the idea of Purgatory became established in the West, *supplanting entirely* the earlier doctrine of the Intermediate State. This substitution made a far greater revolution than we might at first sight imagine. According to the primitive view, both Heaven and Hell are unattainable till after the Day of Judgment. S. Justin Martyr even accuses of heresy those who held that souls attained to Heaven before the coming of Christ.

It is in his "Dialogues" with the learned Jew Trypho—perhaps, as some say, an imaginary character—that the passage is found which refers to this heresy. In his time certain Gnostics denied altogether the Intermediate State, asserting (with most modern Protestants) that when men die their souls fly at once to Heaven. The idea that Heaven and Hell are the immediate issues of this earthly life tend to obscure the resurrection and the final judgment. These heretics overthrew both Jewish and Christian teaching, so Justin said they were neither Jews nor Christians. And he finds fault with them because "they say that there is no resurrection, but that when men die their souls are immediately taken up into Heaven." The date of these "Dialogues" is about A.D. 140.

But with the completion of the doctrine of Purgatory this view was quite altered. The imperfect good people, those who

needed to be purified, were the only souls who could in any sense be said to go to the Intermediate State, and even in their case the period of detention was not limited by the coming of Christ, but ended after a longer or shorter period, as might be necessary. Practically, therefore, the doctrine of Purgatory destroyed the original idea of an Intermediate State.

The more Protestantish of the Reformers, recognizing the extreme error of the Romish Purgatory, so treated the matter that they followed the Romish error of making the holy go straight to Heaven, the wicked direct to Hell, and did away altogether with any idea, even the earliest, of a state where progress was continually going on. The Romans are sufficiently logical to state that the Saints will not experience any last judgment, because, being already in the plenitude of Christ's glory, they can no more be judged. But the Protestants, while asserting that the good people find themselves immediately after death in Heaven with Christ—wearing golden crowns, etc.—and the wicked are thrust immediately into Hell to be tormented with the Devil for ever and ever, these have the idea that the Saints at the Last Day are to be judged and told to return to Heaven whence they have just come, and the wicked to return to Hell whence also they have just come.

We can understand notorious prisoners being kept in ward, "remanded," but to judge and condemn the prisoner after he has already been in the hands of the tormentors, this strikes us as absurd, to punish the prisoner thus before his judgment seems unjust ; and nothing can be urged by Protestants that these prisoners were condemned at the moment of the "immediate judgment," for they do not accept this judgment.

A few Fathers held a "pious opinion" that there was suffering for some immediately after death, and we notice prayers for "a cooling place." And ideas somewhat similar are evident in the Mozarabic Liturgy—whose history is lost in antiquity save that it is of Ephesian origin—as well as in the Gallican, but such instances should not be forced into inculcating the definite Roman doctrine, and, moreover, such are few in number, and the Vincentian Canon cannot be applied to these.

While "The Catechism of the Council of Trent" asserts that certain justified souls "*are in torments*," we read in Session 25 and Session 6, Can. 30 of the Council, that "with the Catholic Church led by the Holy Spirit, and by sacred Scriptures, and by the '*ancient tradition of the Fathers*,' in holy Councils, and afresh in this Synod," it has been taught that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls of the faithful are detained therein, etc.; in Canon 30: "Si quis post acceptam justificationis gratiam cuilibet peccatori pœnitenti ita culpam remitti & reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœne temporalis exolvendæ vel in hoc sæculo vel in futuro in Purgatorio, antequam ad regna celorum aditus patere possit; anathema sit."

In a much-vaunted book—Di Bruno's "Catholic Belief," p. 186, fifth edition—the same claim is made on "Apostolic traditions."

But the Roman is forbidden to interpret the Scriptures otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; the Fathers certainly differed very much about the "cleansing fire," as to its time of appearance, its quality, its nature. The value of the claim may be seen by examining the next one made by Di Bruno when he says that "the belief in Purgatory rests on the authority of the Church

and her Apostolic traditions recorded "— where? — "*in ancient Liturgies*." This is nothing less than barefaced impudence. We have already given quotations from ancient Liturgies showing that prayers for the departed were offered up with very different ideas, that the departed might rest in peace. To distort such prayers for the departed into Masses for relieving faithful justified souls from "excruciating pains" is eminently Romish in impertinence, and Italian in subtlety. If such prayers of the Primitive Church were to relieve souls from "torments," how is it that prayers were offered for Holy Apostles, etc.?

It has been maintained that the words, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord," refer only to the Saints who go straightway from this earth to Heaven. If this be so, then the *ordinary mortal* who has made his Confession, received Absolution, and partaken of the Blessed Sacrament, the "Esca-Viatorum," just before his death, has not died "in the Lord"! Such an one does not "rest from his labours"!! The celebrated controversialist, Cardinal Bellarmine, says: "The Fathers constantly teach that the pains of Purgatory are most fierce"; in such a terrible place the ordinary mortal finds himself after death.

But S. Augustine—although in certain portions of his writings he speaks in a tentative manner of a cleansing fire —constantly teaches that the righteous, or just, are at rest: "It is unlawful to doubt that the *just* and pious are living in rest" ("De Civ. Dei," XII., ch. 29). Now it is only the "just" or justified who go to Purgatory, according to modern Roman theology, the unjustified go straight to Hell. "The received Roman doctrine is that those who go to Purgatory are *justified* souls; and *justification* in the Tridentine sense includes *sanctification, union with Christ*, and the full

enjoyment of faith, hope, charity ('Conc. Trident.' sess. 6, cap. 7); and yet Rome represents those who are in this state as not merely subject to the *justice*, but as pursued by the *wrath*, *anger*, *and vengeance* of God (see Cardinal Wiseman's 'Lectures,' II.), which is an explicit denial of the whole Gospel dispensation" (Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons").

S. Augustine likewise: "*All* souls when they depart this life have their different receptions; the good have joy, the evil torments. The Holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and the good and faithful, have been received in peace, yet all are to receive, at the end, what God has promised. The rest which is given immediately after death is then received by everyone who deserved it when he died. The Patriarchs received it first . . . and *now every day good believers*."

The Roman Church says that only "the Saints" receive rest, for they are taken straight to Heaven. But according to this celebrated dialectician, S. Augustine, the rest is "received every day by good believers." Now "Saints" (in the full Roman sense) do not die every day, and we read above, all souls which are good "have joy."

S. Augustine suggests a purifying process in the next state—a continuance of the same principle of suffering in this life, which sufferings are intended to purify and refine us—but he does not tie himself down to such an opinion or belief; for, writing thereon, he says: "Incredibile non est, et utrum ita est quæri potest."

We likewise appeal to that venerable and conservative body, the Eastern—*i.e.*, Greek-Catholic and Russian-Catholic—Churches. Do they sanction or countenance "the Romish doctrine" of Purgatory as an Article of Faith? Certainly not.

De Wette (I., 367): "Cum Græcis illud non credentes nunquam sint habiti ob hoc pro hæreticis, nisi apud novissimos hærecantissimos hæreticantes."

The Greek Church, in her "Longer Catechism," holds that "the righteous are in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness" (Blackmore's translation, pp. 98, 99).

There is this further testimony to the fact that the Romish Purgatory was denied long ago by the Easterns, for Francis Alphonso a Castro (1495-1558, Archbishop of Compostella, Franciscan Confessor to Philip II.), in his treatise against heretics, published in 1534, wrote: "Unus ex notissimis erroribus *Græcorum* et *Armenorum* est quo docent *nullum esse Purgatorium*, locum in quo animæ ab hac luce migrantes purgentur a sordibus quas in corpore contraxerant" ("Adv. Hær. Lib.," XIII., folio, 1316).

Polydore Virgil (c. 1470-1555), in his work "De inventoribus Rerum," and in Book VIII. (published in 1521), states: "Nemo certe dubitat orthodoxus, an Purgatorium sit, de quo tamen *apud priscos nulla vel quam rarissima fiebat mentio*, sed et *Græcis ad hunc usque diem non creditum est.*"

S. Thomas Aquinas, in his work "Summa contra Græcos," wrote of the Easterns as being in error: "When they deny Purgatory, they diminish the virtue of this Sacrament" (of the Eucharist), "because it is the custom in the Church to offer Mass for the living and the dead, and by doing away with Purgatory the efficacy of the Mass as regards the dead is destroyed. For neither those in Hell—from which there is no redemption—nor to those in glory, who have no need of our suffrages, can it be of any advantage."

But S. Thomas does away entirely with that Intermediate State of the faithful departed which we call "Paradise." We who pray that the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar may

profit the faithful departed are just those who do not limit God's power, and we believe that It could benefit those in Purgatory—were there such a place—so we do not diminish the virtue of that Holy Sacrament, but we say that no such third place of intermediate existence as that of the "Romish" Purgatory is to be found among the Early Fathers and in the Primitive Church.

Moreover, why should S. Thomas be considered an incontrovertible expositor? According to the Romish School, he is utterly in error with respect to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception! If you quote him against the Immaculate Conception dogma, the Jesuit replies that S. Thomas wrote in this case as a "private Doctor," and therefore, though canonized, his opinions on the Immaculate Conception are erroneous. Why should he not have written what he did concerning Purgatory as a "private Doctor" also? However cautious a theologian he may have been, it is not impossible that he was unconsciously and unduly swayed by his great aim, namely, to build up the Papal system on the foundation of Gregory, which system was immensely fostered by the Romish principle of Purgatory, by which principle a third kingdom was placed under the sovereignty of the Pope. He may have been as much in error on this point as he was deceived, in company with Urban IV., by a collection of spurious Greek Councils and Fathers when they were laid before him in 1261—upon which forgeries the Papal claims so depend.

Granted that at the Council of Florence—opened on February 6th, 1439—the Greek delegates accepted the Roman doctrine: but they were in great straits, and present from motives purely political. The Greek Empire was threatened with the invasion of the victorious Mohammedans

—Constantinople was captured by them in May, 1453—and the Greeks were desirous of Latin assistance. At Florence the delegates themselves were almost starved, it being a matter of great difficulty to obtain money wherewith to buy food, their pay being sometimes three months in arrears. They were prevented by the Roman authorities from leaving the city, and the Greek Bishop, Mark Eugenius of Ephesus, was forbidden by the Emperor of Germany to formulate or state the Eastern doctrine of the state of departed souls. In 1443 the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, being assembled in a large Council, refused to accept their fellow-Churchmen's surrender to Latin distortion and Popish invention; the Russian Patriarch Isidore, formerly Bishop of Illyria, on his return to his own country was condemned and imprisoned, besides being styled a matricide, false pastor, and heretic; in fact, the Oriental Churches repudiated the whole Italian business.

But did the Easterns at this Council accept the "Romish doctrine" of Purgatory? Let us see what are the views of the Orthodox Churches of the East concerning the Council of Florence. We may gain information on this point by reading "The History of the Council of Florence"; translated from the Russian by Basil Popoff, student of the S. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy; edited by the Rev. J. M. Neale, D.D. (Published by Masters, 1861).

Beginning at page 47, we find:—

"In the fifth sitting (June 4), Cardinal Julian gave the following definition of the Latin doctrine on Purgatory:—'From the time of the Apostles,' he said, 'the Church of Rome has taught, that the souls departed from this world, pure and free from every taint—namely the souls of Saints—immediately enter the regions of bliss. The souls of

those who afterwards sincerely repented and confessed their sins, though unable to perform the *epitimia* laid upon them by their spiritual Father, or bring forth fruits of repentance sufficient to atone for their sins, these souls are purified by the fire of Purgatory, some sooner, others slower, according to their sins; and then, after their purification, depart for the land of eternal bliss. The prayers of the priest, liturgies, and deeds of charity conduce much to their purification. The souls of those dead in mortal sin, or in original sin, go straight to punishment.

"'The Greeks demanded a written exposition of this doctrine. When they received it, Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion of Nice each wrote their remarks on it, which afterwards served as a general answer to the doctrine of the Latins.

"'When giving in this answer (June 14th), Bessarion explained the difference of the Greek and Latin doctrine on this subject. The Latins, he said, allow that now, and until the day of the last judgment, departed souls are purified by fire, and are thus liberated from their sins; so that, he who has sinned the most will be a longer time undergoing purification, whereas he whose sins are less will be absolved the sooner, with the aid of the Church; but in the future life they allow the eternal, and not the purgatorial fire. Thus the Latins receive both the temporal and the eternal fire, and call the first the purgatorial fire. On the other hand, the Greeks teach of one eternal fire alone, understanding that the temporal punishment of sinful souls consists in that they for a time depart into a place of darkness and sorrow, are punished by being deprived of the Divine light, and are purified—that is, liberated from this place of darkness and woe—by means of prayers, the Holy

Eucharist, and deeds of charity, and not by fire. The Greeks also believe, that until the union of the souls to the bodies, as the souls of sinners do not suffer full punishment, so also those of the Saints do not enjoy entire bliss. But the Latins, agreeing with the Greeks in the first point, do not allow the last one, affirming that the souls of Saints have already received their full heavenly reward.

"'In the following sitting the Latins presented a defence of their doctrine on Purgatory. As much as can be concluded from the answer given by the Greeks to it, they tried to prove their doctrine by the words of 2 Macc. xii. 42, 46, where it is said that Judas Maccabæus "sent to Jerusalem to offer a sin offering," remarking at the same time "that it was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin." They also quoted the words of Jesus Christ: "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (S. Matt. xii. 32). But their especial defence was founded on the words of the Apostle S. Paul (1 Cor. iii. 11, 15): "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Different extracts were also made by the Latins from the works of the Eastern Fathers—Basil the Great, Epiphanius of Cyprus, John Damascene, Dionysius

the Areopagite, Theodoret, Gregory of Nyssa; and the Western—Augustine, Ambrose, and Gregory the Great. They did not also forget to quote the authority of the Church of Rome in defence of their doctrine, and to make use of their usual sophistries.

"'To all this the Orthodox party gave a clear and satisfactory answer. They remarked, that the words quoted from the book of the Maccabees, and our Saviour's words, can only prove that some sins will be forgiven after death; but whether by means of punishment by fire, or by other means, nothing was known for certain. Besides, what has forgiveness of sins to do with punishment by fire and tortures? Only one of these two things can happen; *either* punishment *or* forgiveness, and not both at once.

"'In explanation of the Apostle's words, they quoted the commentary of S. John Chrysostom, who, using the word *fire*, gives it the meaning of an eternal, and not temporary, purgatorial fire; explains the words *wood*, *hay*, *stubble*, in the sense of bad deeds, as food for the eternal fire; the word *day*, as meaning the day of the last judgment; and the words *saved yet so as by fire*, as meaning the preservation and continuance of the sinner's existence while suffering punishment. Keeping to this explanation, they reject the other explanation given by S. Augustine, founded on the words *shall be saved*, which he understood in the sense of *bliss*, and consequently gave quite another meaning to all this quotation. "It is very right to suppose," wrote the Orthodox teachers, "that the Greeks should understand Greek words better than foreigners. Consequently, if we cannot prove that any one of those Saints, who spoke the Greek language, explains the Apostle's words, written in Greek, in a sense different to that given by the blessed John, then surely we

must agree with the majority of these Church celebrities." The expressions σωθῆναι, σωζέσθαι, and σωτήρια, used by heathen writers, mean in our language continuance, existence (διαμένειν, εἶναι). The very idea of the Apostle's words shows this. As fire naturally destroys, whereas those who are doomed to eternal fire are not destroyed, the Apostle says that they continue in fire, preserving and continuing their existence, though at the same time they are being burned by fire. To prove the truth of such an explanation of these words by the Apostle (v. 11, 15), they make the following remarks: The Apostle divides all that is *built* upon the proposed *foundation* into two parts, never even hinting of any third, middle part. By *gold*, *silver*, *stones*, he means virtues; by *hay*, *wood*, *stubble*, that which is contrary to virtue, *i.e.*, bad works. "Your doctrine," they continued to tell the Latins, "would perhaps have had some foundation if he (the Apostle) had divided bad works into two kinds, and had said that one kind is purified by God, and the other worthy of eternal punishment. But he made no such division; simply naming the works entitling man to eternal bliss, *i.e.*, virtues, and those meriting eternal punishment, *i.e.*, sins. After which he says: "Every man's work shall be made manifest," and shows when this will happen; pointing to that last day, when God will render unto all according to their merits: "For the day," he says, "shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire." Evidently, this is the day of the second coming of Christ, the coming age, the *day* so called in a particular sense, or as opposed to the present life, which is but night. This is the day when He will come in glory, and a fiery stream shall precede Him (Dan. vii. 10; Ps. l. 3; xcvii. 3; 2 S. Peter iii. 12, 15). All this shows us that S. Paul speaks here of the last day,

and of the eternal fire prepared for sinners. "This fire," says he, "shall try every man's work of what sort it is," enlightening some works, and burning others with the workers. But when the evil deed will be destroyed by fire, the evil doers will not be destroyed also, but will continue their existence in the fire, and suffer eternally. Whereas then the Apostle does not divide sins here into mortal and venial, but deeds in general into good and bad; whereas the time of this event is referred by him to the final day, as by the Apostle Peter also, whereas, again, he attributes to the fire the power of destroying all evil actions, but not the doers; it becomes evident that the Apostle Paul does not speak of purgatorial fire, which, even in your opinion, extends not over all evil actions, but over some of the minor sins. But these words also: "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss" (ζημιωθήσεται, *i.e.*, shall lose), show that the Apostle speaks of the eternal tortures; they are *deprived* of the Divine light; whereas this cannot be spoken of those purified, as you say; for they not only do not lose anything, but even acquire a great deal, by being freed from evil, and clothed in purity and candour.

"'In answer to the words quoted by the Latins from Basil the Great (in his prayer for Pentecost), Epiphanius, John Damascene, and Dionysius the Areopagite — the defenders of the Orthodox doctrine remarked, that these quotations did not prove anything to the advantage of the Church of Rome. They could not even find the testimony of Theodoret adduced by the Latins. "Only one Father remains," they continued, "Gregory the blessed priest of Nyssa, who, apparently, speaks more to your advantage than any of the other Fathers. Preserving all the respect due to this Father, we cannot refrain from noticing, that he

was but a mortal man, and man, however great a degree of holiness he may attain, is very apt to err, especially on such subjects, which have not been examined before or determined upon in a general Council by the Fathers." The Orthodox teachers, when speaking of Gregory, more than once restrict their words by the expression: "*If such was his idea*," and conclude their discussion upon Gregory with the following words: "*We must view the general doctrine of the Church, and take the Holy Scripture as a rule for ourselves, nor paying attention to what each has written in his private capacity* (ἰδίᾳ)."

"'The Eastern teachers said, concerning the testimonies of the Western Fathers that they were rather ignorant of them, not having any translation in Greek, and tried to excuse them by the circumstances under which they wrote, their misunderstanding the Apostle's words (1 Cor. iii. 11, 15), the difficulty of drawing a general conclusion from many circumstances (founded on visions), etc. As regards the weight of the opinion of the Church of Rome pointed to by the Latins, it was found by the Greeks to be inconsistent with the subject then in hand.

"'Lastly, to the Latin sophistries, they opposed the more valid conclusions from the principles of the doctrine of Christ, from many works of the Fathers, from the parable of Lazarus, where mention is made of Abraham's bosom—the place of bliss—and of Hell the place of punishment; and nothing is said of any intermediate place for temporal punishments.

"'The Greek answer was evidently intended to show the Latins the unsoundness of their newly-invented doctrine on the one side, and the steadfastness of the Orthodox party in the faith handed down to them by the Apostles and the holy Fathers, on the other. In the course of the disputes

the principal question branched off into so many light and abstract questions, that as a matter of course the solution of the chief one became still more difficult. The Latins for instance asked—where and how the angels fly? What was the substance of hellfire? The last question met with the following answer from Jagaris, the imperial officer: "The querist will get a satisfactory solution to his question when he experiences the nature of the fire himself."

"'The question on Purgatory not being agreed upon, another one was proposed—that about the blissful state of the righteous, alluded to by Bessarion in his treatise on the difference of the doctrines of both Churches on the condition of the departed souls. It was asked—whether the Saints, departed from this life, attained entire bliss or not? Before discussing this question, the Greeks found it necessary to have a private conference with the other members of the Council. With this intention all the members assembled in the Patriarch's cell (July 15), and read over different testimonies of the Fathers; the Emperor bade them collect their votes. Some gave a negative answer to the question, founding it on the Apostle's words (Heb. xi. 39), others gave a positive answer. The next day, after a few disputes, the whole Council of Greek Bishops unanimously agreed, that though the souls of the Saints, as souls, are already in the enjoyment of bliss, still when, at the general resurrection they will join their bodies, then their bliss will be greater; that then they will be enlightened like the sun. This was their last answer to the Latin doctrine on the state of souls after death.

"'What then were the fruits of these tedious discussions? Did they conduce in any manner to the solution of the principal question concerning the union of Churches? No!

The Latin theologians could neither find firm proofs for their opinions, nor would they give them up. The Greeks again would not receive a doctrine not founded on any good proofs, nor could they incline the Latins to receive the Orthodox doctrine.' "

Certainly the "doctrina Romanensium" was not accepted "ab omnibus."

A further exposition of Eastern principles and opinions was made in the eighteenth century by certain Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church in their correspondence with the English Non-jurors: "As for the purgatorial fire, invented by the Papists to command the purse of the ignorant, we will by no means hear of it. For it is a fiction, a doting fable . . . it has no existence save in the imagination . . . (there is) *no appearance of it in the Sacred Scriptures or* HOLY FATHERS. But we say that the benefactions and Holy Sacrifices, the alms and the prayers of the Church, and of her priests for the dead, are the things that greatly profit them, and not the purgatorial fire, which does not by any means anywhere exist" (From a statement made by Chrysanthus Patriarch of Jerusalem, Jeremiah Patriarch of Constantinople, and Samuel Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1718).

The Greek Church feels strongly on the doctrine of prayers for the departed, upholding it strongly, but that such prayers do not necessarily imply Purgatory is seen by the following statement of that ancient conservative Family of the Catholic Church: "No part of Scripture touches on it, nor is there found any temporary purgative punishment after death for sin."

Above all, Origen's opinion was condemned just for this very reason in the Second Council of Constantinople: " . . . As to the fables which certain men utter about souls,

when they have left this world without sufficient penance, they are tortured . . . the Church has never received them" (see Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons," p. 132, ed. 1892).

The Greeks, in their Apology at the Council of Basle (opened in 1431), said: "We own no purgatorial fire, nor any temporary punishment which shall have an end, *for we received no such thing by tradition*, nor doth the Eastern Church acknowledge to receive it."

In 1895 the Orthodox Greek Church sent a reply to the Encyclical of Leo XIII., which reply contained these words: "To pray that those who rest in the Lord may, of God's mercy, find pardon and grace, is an ancient custom among us, while the ideas of purgatorial fire, of works of supererogation (*περὶ καθαρτηρίου πυρος περὶ περισσείας ἔργων*), and of the full reward of the just (*τελείαν ἀνταπόδοσιν τοῖς δικαίοις*) before the general resurrection and the Judgment, are novelties introduced by the Papal Church since the twelfth century."*

Not only this but also further has the Greek-Catholic Church thus expressed herself in her "Orthodox Confession": "*Πῶς πρέπει να γροικοῦμεν διὰ το πῦρ τὸ καθαρτήριον; οὐδεμία γραφὴ διαλαμβάνει περὶ αὐτοῦ νὰ εὑρίσκεται δηλαδὴ κἂν μία πρόσκαιρος κόλασις καθαρτικὴ τῶν ψυχῶν ὕστερα ἀπὸ τον θάνατον.*"

* Since we wrote this we have become acquainted with an excellent translation of the Reply in English, pub. by Rumpus, of Oxford Street: "XII. The one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Seven Œcumenical Councils, in accordance with inspired teaching of Holy Scripture and with the Apostolic tradition of old, prays and invokes the mercy of God for pardon and repose of them that are asleep in the Lord. But the papal Church, from the twelfth century onwards, invented and accumulated in the person of the Pope — as sole possessor of privileges—a multitude of innovations touching a purgatorial fire, touching the superabundance of merits in Saints, and their distribution to those in need of them, and such like; and she has furthermore propounded (the belief in) a complete recompense of the righteous before the universal resurrection and judgment" (S. Matt. xxv. 31; Heb. xi. 40; 2 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Macab. xii. 43-45).

Of which Greek sentence the following is an English translation: "What does it behove us to believe about the cleansing fire? No Scripture states clearly where it is to be found, nor yet even that there is, a temporal cleansing chastisement for souls after death."

We now refer again to the Bonn Conference of 1874.

At the Sixth Conference held on September 16th, Dr. Von Döllinger speaking, arrived at length at the following portion of his remarks (p. 80):—

"The Sixth Article (Of the State of the Departed) propounds a peculiar theory of the Intermediate State, on which we can pronounce no opinion.* We have already stated our rejection of the Roman doctrine of indulgences for the dead.

"*Tatschaloff:* We are quite satisfied with that. We teach no real 'purification' after death, *i.e.*, no repentance or moral amendment.

"*Rhossis:* The doctrine of a purification of souls after death is certainly taught by S. Gregory Nyssen, who, like Origen, connects it with the doctrine of the so-called ἀποκατάστασις. It is not, however, a distinct teaching of the Eastern Church, although she accepts the doctrine of an Intermediate State between death and the last Judgment.

"*Janyschew:* We are quite satisfied with the rejection of the doctrine of indulgences for the dead. Dr. Döllinger does not seem to understand the first clause of the Article.

* The Article is as follows: "There is an Intermediate State where souls awaiting the Judgment experience a forestate of future bliss or torment. Through the mercy of God they can be benefited by the intercessions of the Church, and especially by the Sacrifice of the Mass." In contrast with this is given "the doctrine of the Western Church": "Whoever has not made complete satisfaction for his sins upon earth, passes after death into Purgatory, where he makes satisfaction to the Divine Justice by the endurance of temporal punishment. From this punishment the souls of the departed can be freed by the intercession of the faithful, by the offering of Masses in their behalf, and by indulgences."

"*Döllinger:* I quite understand it; but I was not aware that the theory it sets forth, which is unknown to the West, formed part of the Eastern faith. There is nothing about it in the Greek Catechism of the Synod as far as I know.

"*Janyschew:* It is taught in one of our Catechisms."

(The Catechism referred to is that from which quotations are made (Blackmore's translation) towards the end of Chapter II. of this volume.)

In the Canon of the Mass of the Roman Liturgy we see a prayer for the departed which contradicts the "doctrina Romanensium," that all—save the Saints—suffer torments in Purgatory. For in the prayer the Celebrant uses such words as these: "Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and handmaidens which have gone before us with the sign of faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace. *To them*, O Lord, and *to all that are at rest in Christ*, we beseech Thee that Thou wouldest grant a place of refreshment, of light, and of peace." The people here referred to and prayed for cannot be the Saints, for the Tridentine Decree says that the Saints are reigning *in Heaven with Christ*. If the statement of the Decree be right and true they are enjoying and sharing in the transcendental glory of Heaven. The prayer for refreshment, light, and peace cannot be offered up for those who pace by the crystal river, and the imperishable Tree of Life; not for those who see, without being blinded, the Light of the Lamb, the Light in which they are clothed, not for those who behold the Prince of Peace, the ineffable Face of Jesus. Neither can the souls thus prayed for be the souls of the damned, for they are in the torments of the worm undying.

What class of people remains? That which is composed of those who in this life formed by far the greatest bulk of

Christians, the average sort of people, neither very good nor very bad, struggling, falling, rising up again, and so forth. In short, they must be those who are being purified from stain of venial sins by the fire of Purgatory, who are in such excruciating tortures that the Roman Churchman cannot but give liberally in order that such souls may be delivered from that twilight realm over which the Blessed Virgin rules with ever-widening mercy.

But in this prayer these souls are spoken of as being "at rest in Christ." Must we therefore—to be consistent—pray somewhat in this fashion: "Remember . . . Thy servants who sleep the sleep of peace in excruciating torments at rest in Christ"?

Referring again to the statement of the Decree that Purgatory—such as at present held by the Roman Church—was taught and is proved by *ancient tradition of the Fathers* we find that the statement, as it seems to us, was not altogether accepted by Cardinal Newman. He wrote: "As time went on the doctrine of Purgatory was opened upon the apprehension of the Church," which words can be taken with the same author's statements in his "Development"—"Clement may hold a Purgatory, yet tend to consider all punishment purgatorial. S. Hilary may believe in a Purgatory, yet confine it to the Day of Judgment. Prayers for the faithful departed may be found in the early Liturgies, yet with an indistinctness which included S. Mary and the Martyrs in the same rank with the imperfect Christians whose sins were as yet unexpiated" (see also quotation from Polydore Virgil, on page 97).

One cannot help recalling to mind the accusation of the Toledo Council in 688 against Pope Benedict—in the matter of forgeries—and applying it to the system upon which

Romish writers attempt to base the whole doctrine of Purgatory and indulgences, "a barefaced contradiction of the Fathers," quite the opposite to "antiqua patrum traditione."

Many opinions have been held in the Romish Church as to the nature of purgatorial fire, but inasmuch as this nature is not of faith we need not speak thereon.

For the same reason we need not delay the reader with any statements and suggestions as to the locality, except to say that the curious may find "la description la plus detaillée et pour ainsi dire la topographie la plus exacte du Purgatoire, et comme la carte geographique du royaume de la douleur," by reading alleged revelations made to SS. Francesca Romana and Maria Magdalena of Pazzi, or in the Roman Missal of 1552.*

But a further objection to the Romish doctrine lies in the false notion of Divine forgiveness which the belief engenders.

Into Purgatory were sent all those who *having died forgiven* —with respect to mortal, deadly, sins—have yet to undergo the pains of Purgatory which "is only for those who die with venial faults, and for those who depart this life with punishment due, their faults having already been laid aside" (Cardinal Bellarmine, d. 1621), to satisfy Divine justice.

"Whosoever shall affirm that God always remits the whole punishment together with the fault let him be accursed" ("Council of Trent," sess. XIV., cap. IX., can. XII.).

* S. Francesca Romana was born at Rome in 1384, and died in 1440. She was the founder of the Order of Collatines, and was canonized in 1608 by Paul V. Maria Magdalena of Pazzi was born in Florence in 1556, and died in 1607. In 1583 she took the Carmelite habit. She was beatified by Urban VIII. in 1626, and canonized by Alexander VII. in 1699.

It was argued that though a man confessed his sins with a truly penitent mind, was absolved, received the Viaticum, the all-cleansing Body and Blood of his Saviour, and forthwith breathed his last, still such an one could not have paid the *large debt of suffering* due to him in expiation of his venial sins, which punishment consisted of "the temporary punishment," either of "pœna sensus"—punishment to the senses by torment—or of "pœna damni"—that is, not an absolute and positive infliction of the senses, still less of purgatorial fire, but chiefly a withdrawal and consequent absence and loss of God's presence, for "*pœna damni*" means the *punishment* of *loss* by being cut off from the presence of God—which was the punishment inflicted on Cain; it was a purging of this latter character that the Greeks maintained in the Council of Florence.*

Upon whom then, according to "doctrina Romanensium," are these torments inflicted? *Upon those whom God had forgiven*, but—as we have already said—who had not discharged

* Bishop Forbes of Brechin (speaking of people who have led a worldly life, and yet seem to us to have had a faith or hope in Christ, and to have hoped that He would not cast them into Hell, but have scarce thought of Him in any other way, and if careless, have not committed the greater sins), says: "Will God think it best for them at once to admit them into His presence, which they have never desired? Or would they be fit to enjoy it, if He did? But if not, and if, when the soul is parted from all earthly distractions, it comes to see that God is its only Good, and is yet withheld from His beatific sight"—that is from the soul's sight of Him—"that it may learn to long for Him, this is at once what the schools have called the 'pœna damni'; and this awakened, *unsatisfied longing*, with the sense that through its own fault, it remains in this darkness as to God may be *intenser pain* than any, or than all, the pain which could be accumulated in one in this life. We know what pain separation from an object of deep human love occasions. What may it not be of God?" ("Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 345. Fourth Edition, 1881).

It must not be for one moment supposed that the above intends to advocate the idea of "Universalism," which idea must be guarded against as not in accordance with the Catholic Faith.

(This Bishop Forbes must not be confused with Bishop Forbes of Ross and Caithness, 1762-1775, himself a writer.)

the temporal penalty which the justice of God demanded!

Well might that brilliant philosophical writer, William Archer Butler, write: "If souls elect, saved, forgiven, are after death to be tortured for thousands of years in purgatorial flames, and depend upon their sole chance of alleviation or release on Masses on earth, how incomprehensible was the absence of earnest loving Paul—knowing all this thoroughly—from any allusion to the necessity of such helps for those wretched spirits."

Just so! This dying person having received all the consolations of religion, his soul having winged its flight sustained by the "Food of Travellers," and then received its "Immediate Judgment," finds himself amid tortures equal in their inconceivable agonies to those of the Devil and the damned, differing only from those of Hell in that though eternal they are not everlasting.

There is no doubt but that this man died in a state of Justification. What is understood by this "state of Justification" and what does it imply? The Council of Trent informs us that "Justification is not merely remission of sin, but also Sanctification, and the complete renovation of the inner man by the voluntary reception of Divine grace and gifts, so that he who before was unrighteous is made righteous, and he who was formerly an enemy against becomes the friend of God. When a man is justified and united to Christ, he receives, together with the remission of sins, the following gifts bestowed on him at the same time—Faith, Hope, Charity." *

This Christian man, his soul and spirit, has therefore

* The reader is referred to the Twenty-five Articles drawn up at the Council in 1546, given by Sarpi, Lib. 2, pp. 192-3. Of these Articles, (2) says: "Justifying faith is a sure trust, by which one believes that his sins are remitted for Christ; and those that are justified are bound to believe certainly

become "holy, just, pleasing to God, the adopted son of God," and his soul and spirit cleansed from all defilement. Yet such an one is in excruciating tortures, and though united to Christ and fulfilled with the unutterable gift of sanctifying Grace, he suffers agonies—and what for? to *satisfy the justice of God!* Having been pardoned and absolved and received Grace, we venture to think that God "freely forgave him the debt."

And to one's mind occurs a passage from the Eighth Homily of S. John Chrysostom in his Epistle to the Romans: "Where there is Grace, there is remission; where there is remission, there is no punishment."

Justification (both imputative and inherent), and *sanctification* (the state or condition brought about by the operation of the Holy Spirit), are processes of progression, by no means causative of immediate purity of mind and soul, but they start a process, itself imperfect at the beginning, nevertheless, these two gifts enable the individual to co-operate with the Will of Almighty God, thereby affording that human being a power to ascend nearer and nearer towards that perfection of holiness without which no man can enter into Heaven; it should not be urged that a justified, sanctified soul enters the fullest joys of Heaven immediately after his death.

* * * * * *

We have endeavoured to show that it was chiefly owing to the *distortion* of Primitive and Catholic practice of praying for the departed which produced the error of Purgatory

that their sins are remitted." (16) "The justified are set free from guilt and punishment, and satisfaction, neither in this life nor after death, is necessary; and therefore there is no Purgatory, or satisfaction, which is part of penance." (24) "All the justified are received into equal grace and glory, and all Christians are equally great with the Mother of God, and as much Saints as she."

à la Romaine. It by no means follows that such prayers should therefore be discountenanced, for the *abuse* of a thing or of a custom does not take away the lawful *use* thereof, for "Is confirmat *usum* qui tollit *abusum*."

We now bring to the notice of the reader a valuable work too little known in our country. This is the work of an Orthodox Bishop, existing—as far as we know—in two languages only, viz., in the original Russian, and in a French translation. Being absolutely ignorant of the former tongue we have been compelled to go to the translation, and to do our best to translate into English.

We all know how a book loses force when translated; how much more so when we have to trust to the translation of a translation!

Moreover, one may be a good French scholar and yet find subtle difficulties in the right choice of a theological word to express in the translation exactly the same idea as was intended in the original text; we prefer giving a bold translation to running the risks attendant upon attempts to refinement.

The work referred to and here quoted was mentioned to us by an Archimandrite residing in England, and is known to us as "Theologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe, *par Macaire, Docteur en Theologie, Evèque de Vinnitza, Recteur de l'Academie Ecclesiastique de Saint Petersbourg:* traduite par un Russe." It is out of print; we have been unable to purchase a copy in London, Paris, and Brussels.

"The Roman Church believes and teaches that penitential exercises are, to speak correctly, temporary chastisements which the penitent person should submit to in order that he may offer some kind of a satisfaction to the divine justice on account of his sins.

"This opinion contradicts Catholic doctrine concerning

satisfying divine justice and the justification of the sinner. The Word of God teaches us that our Saviour Jesus Christ offered once for all to the divine justice a full, perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole human race: that He endured all those sufferings to which sinners were liable on account of their iniquity (Isa. liii. 5; Rom. iii. 25; Col. i. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 24; 1 John ii. 2), and that He became the everlasting Kingly Sacrificer, Who . . . (Heb. viii. 25): this, on the one hand, the doctrine teaches.

"On the other hand, the Catholic doctrine teaches that for the satisfaction of sinners before God—*i.e.*, in order that sinners may acquire the benefits of the Redeemer *—the sinners must fulfil two conditions: first of all, repentance and faith . . . ; next, of good works, as fruits and witnesses of their repentance and faith. . . .

"It is by fulfilling these conditions that the sinner can be brought within touch of the Saviour's merits. . . .

"To assert that a penitent sinner—over and above fervent faith and good works, indispensable to everyone who wishes to be in touch with the Saviour's merits—to assert that such an one must undergo punishment, nominally to satisfy the divine justice on account of their sins, this would be to affirm one of two things: either (1) the Saviour suffered insufficiently for sinners, that the satisfaction which He gave for the sins of the world is still incomplete, and that to complement this insufficiency the sufferings of penitent sinners must be added; or (2) that faith and good works are insufficient whereby he may gain benefits on account of the Saviour's merits.

* In the French "s'approprier"; litt. to appropriate to oneself. Littrée gives, "s'approprier = se mettre à la portée de" (*i.e.*, to be within reach, touch; from Latin *ad* = to, and *proprius* = nearer).

"In other words, this would be to upset the Catholic doctrine of Redemption and of Justification.

"This" (Romish) "opinion is no less opposed to the idea of divine justice. If—as the Latins and we indeed agree upon—our Saviour Jesus Christ have already offered to the divine justice a sufficient sacrifice, indeed in superabundance, for the sins of the whole world (Gal. iii. 13, etc.), and that still it is demanded from repentant sinners not only that they have faith in the Saviour, whereby they share in His merits (Rom. iii. 25), and that they offer fruits meet for repentance, but also, in addition, that they submit to punishment—even if only temporary—for their sins, to satisfy the eternal justice, in this case the eternal justice punishes twice for sins, and receives satisfaction twice for the same sin.

"In short, if at the tribunal of the eternal justice such satisfactions be really and absolutely necessary—even on the part of penitent sinners—then, without doubt, must the satisfactions be necessary with respect to all sins, of course in different degrees according to the diversity of the sins: yet, according to the Latins, it is only upon certain sinners—upon the worst only—that the eternal justice inflicts punishments of this sort, whereas with respect to others and their sins every punishment is remitted by penitence. . . ."

"It is true that certain ancient Doctors of the West, *e.g.*, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, sometimes spoke of penances as *satisfactions*, but they did not thereby mean that the performance, the carrying out, of these penances possessed in itself any propitiatory merits, propitiating for sin in the sight of the divine justice: they merely meant that — like paternal chastisements — they aroused within sinners true repentance, which appeases the Heavenly Father, and that—like pious exercises—they exhibited to

penitents the means and opportunity wherein to express and to witness before God concerning the truth and depth of their repentance, which alone is pleasing to God."

But a great change was to come over the subject of Purgatory. A remarkable revolution—a partial one, if you will—concerning the nature of Purgatory.

We draw the reader's attention to the Treatise on Purgatory, by S. Catherine of Genoa. This saintly woman, born in 1447, produced a work which shows the mind of a good woman ever striving after spiritual things, a treatise very remarkable, if only from its trend of thought, whereby some of its contents may be accepted by those members of the Church of England who have carefully examined with an equal mind the points of doctrine connected with this subject.

We have referred to, and quoted from, opinions expressed by mediæval writers concerning Purgatory, a very realistic Purgatory indeed.

In quoting from S. Catherine's Treatise we make use of the Third Edition of the translation from the original Italian, sanctioned by Cardinal Manning in 1858, with an addition of two appendices.

In the Middle Ages it was held, as we have said before, that the pains of the Romish Purgatory were considered to be as terrible as the excruciating tortures of Hell.

It will be remembered that at the Council of Florence the Easterns were considered to be grievously lacking because they declined to accept the Romish conception of the purgatorial fires, (probably of material fire): this conception has been done away with; at least, so it appears.

"The Latins receive both the temporal and the eternal fire, and call the former the purgatorial fire. On the other

hand, the Greeks teach of one eternal fire alone" (*i.e.*, of one fire only, and that the eternal), "understanding that the temporal punishment of sinful souls consists in that they for a time depart into a place of darkness and sorrow, are punished by being deprived of the Divine light, and are purified—that is, liberated from this place of darkness and woe—by means of prayers, the Holy Eucharist, and deeds of charity, *and not by fire*."

It seems to us that S. Catherine holds views which, in some points, resemble those of the Greeks.

Yes; a transformation did take place after the advent of the Renascence; since the Council of Trent further modifications can be noticed. A change in the nature or quality of purgatorial pain, in its *raison d'être*, in the sensations of the soul and spirit experienced by those in Purgatory.

In the earlier and more lengthy period Sacrifices of Masses were offered for those who, not fully and finally purged, were paying by their sufferings what was due to the Divine justice.

But about the time of the ingenious (but not always ingenuous) Cardinal Bellarmine we find the idea that those ever-to-be-shrunk-from torments of Purgatory do not exist, from which the Papal indulgence-hawkers could liberate, for certain moneys, the souls of other peoples' departed relatives.

The departed grow no better in Purgatory: "Now they are as pure as when they were created": "The rust of sin alone is left, and this they get rid of by the punishment of fire; although they suffer intense pain yet do they also experience intense happiness; they prefer this arrangement to any possible other scheme; they are perfect in love, cleansed from all sin, ready for Heaven."

S. Catherine writes:—

"I do not believe it would be possible to find any joy comparable to that of a soul in Purgatory, except the joy of the blessed in Paradise—a joy which goes on increasing day by day, as God more and more flows in upon the soul, which He does abundantly in proportion as every hindrance to His entrance is consumed away. The hindrance is the rust of sin; the fire consumes the rust, and thus the soul goes on laying itself open to the Divine inflowing" (p. 9).

"They suffer all their *pains gladly*, and would not rid them of a *single pang*, knowing that all is justly deserved and righteously ordained" (p. 25).

"The souls in Purgatory having their wills perfectly conformed to the Will of God, and hence partaking of His goodness, remain satisfied with their condition, which is one of entire freedom from the guilt of sin. For when they passed out of this life, penitent, with all their sins confessed and resolved to sin no more, God straightway pardoned them; and now they are as pure as when they were created; the rust of sin alone is left, and this they get rid of by punishment of fire" (pp. 13, 14).

There is much here that we can agree with. But the word "punishment" may need explanation or comment.

We cannot accept the idea that forgiven souls and spirits are to be "punished," in the ordinary sense of the word. Can we, without too much refining, suggest another application, another signification to "punishment"?

We object to "punishment" in the purifying state if thereby *chastisement* be understood. But punishment—taken in connection with the modified idea of "fire" accepted by S. Catherine—need not, we think, and we are careful to suggest only, and do not assert, necessarily imply chastisement.

A little child is very ill: a stinging plaster is put upon his chest, which, when taken off, leaves an angry red patch; and the nurse says, "How it has punished him!" The poisonous influence has been expelled from the child's body.

The nurse did not mean that the child had received chastisement for being ill, punishment in a corrective form; he could not help having fallen sick; but the expulsion of a dangerous influence, the purifying of the child's chest—so to speak—had caused the child pain.

May we use this as a simile not too far fetched? The soul in Paradise—a purifying state, but not the mediæval Romish Purgatory—has arrived there fully pardoned; it cannot indeed receive chastisement for pardoned sins. But, contrary to S. Catherine's opinion, the soul and spirit retain memory, a recollection of sin, and this recollection prevents perfect purity, it sullies the mental and spiritual parts; the departed enjoy great happiness, but not perfect happiness, and they cannot be "ready for Heaven."

First, because that departed one is structurally imperfect, and must remain so until that soul and spirit shall have been reunited to the body at the general Judgment in the trinity of the tripartite nature of man, the nature in which our Lord Himself walked on this earth, and ascended into Heaven, the same Body, but after a different fashion, reunited to His Soul and Spirit at His Resurrection.

Secondly, because the departed being, at its entrance into Paradise, realizes more than it ever could before *what sin is*, and also because the operation of the intellect (the soul) remembering some sin prevents a perfect state and joy; they cannot be pure as long as they can think of sin, perhaps picturing to themselves past scenes in which their sins were

committed, for the sin and its circumstances of locality may be intertwined in the very reminiscence.

As the higher life and the spiritual light are more and more absorbed by the soul and spirit the recollection of the past evil becomes less powerful, growing ever more faint, "the rust"—and this word of S. Catherine is not ill-chosen —scales off, the soul and spirit approach nearer and nearer to purity, acquiring more strength and power to view and understand those mysteries which eye hath not seen nor ear heard; the perception ever going on from strength to strength, the inhabitant of Paradise is continually experiencing joys more intense and transcendent, approaching ever nearer to the Beatific Vision. Of these in this purifying state S. Catherine says: "They suffer all their pains gladly, *and would not rid them of a single pang.*" These "animæ excruciatæ" (of the Mediævalists) delight in their pains. S. Catherine is quite logical in her statement that the spirits would not wish to have their pains or time in Purgatory abbreviated, for every pang brings them nearer to HIM.

Then why have indulgences whereby their time can be shortened by 28,000 years, or even by one week?

S. Catherine wrote thus:—

"And when the soul finds itself on its way back to that first state, it is so enkindled with the desire of becoming one with God, that this desire becomes its Purgatory; not that the soul can look at Purgatory as such, but the instinct by which it is kindled, and the impediment by which it is hindered, constitute its Purgatory" (p. 20).

"It appears to me that the greatest pain the souls in Purgatory endure proceeds from their being sensible of something in themselves displeasing to God, and that it has been done voluntarily against so much goodness; for, being

in a state of grace, they know the truth, and how grievous is any obstacle which does not let them approach God" (p. 17).

"*They experience great happiness, which never grows less, but, on the contrary, goes on increasing, the nearer they approach God.*"

S. Catherine gives the title "Purgatory" to this Intermediate State; but what a change has all but covered the Purgatory of so many Schoolmen!

At the end of the book, concluding Appendix B, are these words, the authorship of which is not disclosed:—

"On the whole, there does not appear anything contrary to sound theology in the idea of such an intrinsic improvement taking place in the soul in Purgatory as is implied in the gradual getting rid of passive bad habits and earthly tastes. Such a notion is very much in accordance with what we know of God's dealings with the soul here on earth, and seems countenanced by the present treatise."

This may be so, we think it very possible; but this is not much like the teaching we hear abroad, and read in tracts; it is very different from the expressions of the School-authors to which the Twenty-second Article objects.

It has been argued that a Purgatory must exist, because in 1 John v. 16, 17, we are told: "There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death."

Now, the sin not unto death cannot surely receive punishment in the same place as that in which punishment will be inflicted for the sin unto death. Hence, it is argued, a third place must exist, and this place is Purgatory.

Yes; that there is *a* Purgatory, a state or place of purifying, this we can believe, but not according to the Romish doctrine.

At the risk of being considered guilty of repetition we continue by saying—with respect to the "sin not unto death"—that if the committer thereof be really penitent before he die, this sin will be forgiven him; for where there is true penitence there is real forgiveness, and this is granted before death.

But the mind (of the departed person) though conscious of forgiveness may not be pure, not being deprived of memory; though the sin is done away, the recollection of sin, of sin particular or of sins general, may cause much pain—not only, as we have already said, because in that state where sin cannot be committed there is so great a realization of the blackness of sin—in consequence of the realization that a sin has prevented the soul starting the next life from as high a terrace as that from which otherwise it might have started, and so the sight of the Beatific Vision is delayed. This may be *a* Purgatory to that soul.

In the (Roman) "Catholic Dictionary," under "Purgatory," we read: "Only a few are sure of ('immediate') entrance into Heaven; the majority are, at their death, still not ripe for Heaven, and yet will not be absolutely excluded from it. Accordingly, we are referred to a third state, a stage between death and eternal life, which serves for the perfect life."

But what necessity for a "third state," unrevealed in Scripture? It seems, at least to us, that to a certain extent S. Catherine advocates the idea that the purifying—perhaps not unconnected with pain, probably with—and great happiness exist together. It seems to us that she describes a place and state not unlike what we think Paradise may be.

We do not see the need of this third place, the Romish Purgatory, nor the need of a Romish doctrine concerning

indulgences; nor the visit of the Blessed Virgin to let out howling captives, as suggested by popular books of neurotic tendencies.

As the "Church Quarterly Review" says: "It may be noticed that Catherine herself would never avail herself of 'Papal Indulgences,' nor would she even beg the prayers of others, with the intention (we suppose) of seeking relief from pain. She knew too well what modern Rome no less than modern Protestantism too often forgets, that the Christian's hope and the promise of the Gospel is the remission of sins, and not the remission of their penalty."

To this chapter we add a quotation from a sermon preached by Canon MacColl in Ripon Cathedral, containing the principles in a nutshell, so to speak. Between the words we have placed in italics, "All souls," some word like "righteous," "good," or "justified," must be supplied.

"If you have followed me so far, you will see that Paradise, or the Intermediate State, is the abode of all who die in the grace of God; but that their condition must necessarily vary indefinitely, from the brand plucked out of the burning to the purity and stability of mature sanctity; from the penitent prodigal to 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' It follows that those diverse characters need diverse treatment; but they have all this note in common, that they are imperfect, more or less incomplete, and will remain so, in spite of general progress, till they are summoned to 'inherit the Kingdom prepared for them.' So entirely did the Church of the first ages believe this that in its Liturgies and monumental inscriptions it prayed for peace, repose, light, refreshment, mercy, for all the departed, including the highest Saints and Martyrs—even the Blessed Virgin, our Lord's Mother. The idea of purgatorial fires through which

departed Christians are continually passing from the Intermediate State into Heaven was then unknown. *All souls* were believed to be in the Intermediate State, in happiness and peace, but in incomplete happiness, and, therefore, fit subjects for the prayers of the Church on earth. The notion of the Intermediate State as a Penal Purgatory through which all the faithful departed are in process of passing into Heaven before the final judgment is a later growth. The Early Church knew nothing of it. In her belief, as attested by Liturgies, epitaphs, and other evidence, all souls remain in the Intermediate State till the Second Advent."

"One word more"—after the manner of the typical preacher. We have seen how different opinions are held about the nature of the Intermediate State, not only in the Roman Communion, but in the Catholic Church at large: even contradictory views are entertained, and by men learned and holy.

What then may we conclude?

That Revelation has raised the veil but slightly, only a corner as it were, and that the greater part of opinions entertained concerning this State and Purgatory is the outcome of the human mind ever striving, with a longing natural and full of faith, to learn more of that region where those loved ones gone before are now in waiting; while this cautionary fact confronts us, that human deductions and conclusions—even of the holiest and most humble-minded—are very prone to error.

It may be asked: "Amid these conflicting views which religion and philosophy, her handmaid, place before us, how much may we and ought we to accept and thoroughly believe, as a minimum?"

We would reply, in all humility, that we may and should

accept the following doctrine as without presumption and with a certain and sure faith. (Some explanations concerning the meanings of words are added.)

As soon as human life is extinct, the disembodied spirit appears before the Supreme Judge for the "*immediate* and *individual judgment*," after which that spirit is sent to "Hell"—using the word "*Hell*" in its proper sense, not as signifying "Gehenna," the place of everlasting pain with Satan, but as meaning the "*hidden state*," the concealed portion of existence. When the Creed reads "He descended into Hell," it is meant that our Lord went in His human spirit, as being Man (1 Peter iii. 18-20, Revised Version), to "*Hades*," not to the abode of undying torments. Now this word "*Hades*" is derived from two Greek words meaning "*the unseen*." The sooner we can make people understand these meanings the better! If we can induce them to use the word "*Gehenna*" for what is *commonly* meant by "Hell," *some* confusion, at least, may be avoided. "*Hell*" is derived from Anglo-Saxon *helan*, to hide, conceal: hence the word "*hole*."

In the Psalms we read that certain people lay "in the *hell* like sheep": "hell" means here the *ruts in the road*, which in some countries are really holes quite three feet deep, even more, quite deep enough to *hide* the sheep from view.

In some parts of England the man who puts tiles on the roof is called a "heller," or "hellier," because he fills up the apertures, the holes in the roof.

Of course, "*Hell*" encloses both the good who will afterwards go to Heaven and also the wicked who will be turned into Gehenna.

We can, without presumption and "curiousness," believe that between the moment after the Immediate Judgment and the great Day of the General Judgment the spirits of the

faithful departed are in an Intermediate State in a condition of lively consciousness, and capable of exercising introspection, retrospection, prospection.

We must hold that they and we are still members of the One Body, fellow-participators in and of One Communion. This being so, not only do they pray for us, but for them we may let our "prayers rise like a fountain day and night," and especially in the Service of the Eucharist, which is also a Service of Comm-*union;* praying that they may progress, that they may have rest in peace, and that Light perpetual may shine upon them. "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of."

A NOTE.

It is to be feared that oftentimes the importance of the Eastern Church with respect to Councils is overlooked, ignored.

This importance of the Eastern Church—as also of the Emperors of the Eastern Empire—is shown by the following table of General Councils, in which may be seen how much more fully she was represented than the Latin, or Western, Church :—

Date.	*Place.*	*Total number of representatives.*	*Eastern Clergy, etc.*	*Western Clergy, etc.*
A.D. 325	Nicæa	318	315	3
,, 381	Constantinople	150	149	1
,, 431	Ephesus	68	67	1
,, 451	Chalcedon	353	350	3
,, 553	Constantinople	164	158	6
,, 680	Constantinople	56	51	5

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning Pardons or Indulgences.

AS "the Sacrifices of Masses" of Article XXXI. does not refer, in intention, to "the Sacrifice of the Mass," so by no means is the doctrine of "Pardons" the same as that of "Pardon," with its natural connections of Penitence, Confession, and Absolution.

When treating of the subject of Purgatory, we saw that the Council of Trent maintained that Purgatory—with its connected ideas of the Romish nature—was a matter of "ancient tradition from the Fathers." Are we wrong in assuming—on the supposition that the statement about tradition be true—that the Romish doctrine of "Pardons" or "Indulgences" is likewise "antiqua patrum traditione"? Whether the claim be made or not, some of the writers of the Roman Communion have maintained the comparatively modern origin and character of this doctrine.

Cardinal Fisher made a trenchant remark on Indulgences: "There was no use of Indulgences for the first twelve centuries; they began after the people were affrighted with the torments of Purgatory."

Durandus of S. Pourçain, Bishop of Meaux (d. 1332)—surnamed "the resolute Doctor"—one of the foremost men

of his time, wrote: "One cannot with certainty say much about Indulgences, because neither the Scriptures nor the Fathers speak definitely thereon" ("Sent. Lib.," IV., Dist. 20).

Also, S. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence (1388-1459, canonized in 1523 by Adrian IV.), wrote thus: "We have no testimony either in the Scriptures or among the Fathers in favour of Indulgences."

The well-known Bishop, Cardinal Cajetan, Papal Legate (1469-1534), said something like this: "We have no certainty about the authority of Indulgences"—*i.e.*, à-la-mode Romaine—"and do not possess on this point any authority either from Holy Scripture, from the Ancient Fathers, or from the Greek and Latin authors" (Tract, "De Indulg.," c. 2).

The principle of Indulgences is indissolubly connected with the modern "Romish doctrine of Purgatory." And this connection is plainly seen on reading the last of "The Ten Articles" issued by Convocation in 1536, intended "to stablish Christian quiet and unity," to bridge over an interval, and were of somewhat Romish tendencies in part.

This Article makes a definite statement, that it is a deed of charity to pray for the departed, upheld by Early Fathers, and even of the most primitive origin, etc., and to do certain things whereby the departed "may be relieved and holpen of some part of their pain; but forasmuch as the place where they be, the name thereof, and kind of pains there also, be to us uncertain by Scripture, wherefore this, with all other things, we remit to God Almighty, unto Whose mercy it is meet and convenient for us to commend them, trusting that God accepteth our prayers for them, referring the rest wholly to God, to Whom is known their estate and condition; wherefore it is much necessary that such abuses be clearly

put away which under the name of Purgatory hath been advanced so as to make men believe that through the Bishop of Rome's pardon souls might clearly be delivered out of Purgatory, and all the pains of it, or that Masses said at Scala Cœli, or otherwhere, in any place, or before any image, might likewise deliver them from all their pain, and send them to Heaven, and other like abuses" ("The Ten Articles of 1536").

This Romish doctrine springs from a distortion of, or from an immoral evolution of, an original truth, as indeed do almost all heresies: it is against *exaggerations* that Article XXII. protests, not against Indulgences, but as against the later developments of such, and as commonly taught and received (as expressed in the italicized words of Bingham quoted six paragraphs further on), "with extreme impudence and to the deception of souls," as Archbishop Neville affirmed in 1466.

We must consider, therefore, of what character were "Indulgences" in the Primitive Church, whence derived, under what circumstances granted, and the scope of their effective action.

Let us consider what "Indulgences" were originally, and how applied; the Council of Trent, let it be noticed, did not define what an "Indulgence" is.

In the earlier times of the Church those who had been guilty of crime, or committed something contrary to Divine law, were censured by the Church, and compelled to do "penance," for the sake of example, and "such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend" (Opening

Sentence of the Commination Service; *cf.* Article XXXIII.). The case of the Emperor Theodosius may occur to the mind of the reader. Theodosius (having caused 7,000 people to be butchered in Thessalonica on account of a tumult which had arisen in that province) was forbidden by S. Ambrose to enter the Cathedral of Milan, and to approach and partake of the Holy Communion. The Emperor had to undergo Penitential Discipline for eight months, after which space of time he received Absolution, and permission to receive the Holy Sacrament.

It was permitted to the Bishop to mitigate, or cancel, the penance; as in the Council of Ancyra (A.D. 314) it was granted that Bishops had the power "either of using clemency, or of adding more time," and in accordance with Canon LXXIV. of S. Basil (d. 379) which directed: "He that hath the power of binding and of unloosing may shorten the time to an earnest penitent." In other words, the proper authority could treat the penitent in a more tender, more *indulgent* manner, and, pardon having been granted, he was readmitted to Holy Communion.

"When the fervour and discipline were weakened, the Church permitted lighter penances, sooner than that the offender should refuse all acts of penitence, and so risk the loss of his soul. Such," says Amort, the Bavarian Canon of the Augustine Order (A.D. 1692-1775), "were the only instances of Indulgences for the first thousand years after our Lord" (Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon," Part III.). Gratian's decree (A.D. c. 1140) left it to individual decision whether the sinner should be reconciled to God by heart-penitence with oral confession. In process of time more was demanded, *e.g.*, contrition of heart, oral confession, and satisfaction by works—"contritio cordis, confessio oris, satisfactio operis."

"The Council of Nicæa, determining the term of penance for such as fell into idolatry, says, that they shall be three years hearers, and ten years prostrators, before they were admitted to communicate in prayers with the people; but if any were more than ordinarily diligent in expressing their concern and tears, and bringing forth good works, the true fruits of repentance, it should be in the Bishop's power to deal more gently and mildly with them, and bring to communicate in prayers sooner. The like order is given by the Council of Ancyra, that Bishops shall have power, upon examination and trial of the penitents' manner of behaviour and conversion, either to show them favour by shortening the time of penance, etc. . . . And this is what some of the Ancients call an *Indulgence; which was not heretofore any pretended power of delivering souls from the pains of Purgatory, by virtue of a stock of merits, or works of supererogation, which they of the Church of Rome call now the Church's treasure*, of which the Pope is become the sole dispenser; but anciently an Indulgence was no more than this power, which every Bishop had, of moderating the canonical punishment, which in the course of penance was inflicted upon sinners, so that if the Bishop saw any one to be a zealous and earnest penitent, he had liberty to shorten the time of his penance, that is, grant him a relaxation of some of his penitential exercises, and admit him sooner than others to Communion. *This was the true ancient notion of an Indulgence*" (Bingham's "Eccl. Antiq.," book XVIII., ch. iv.).

This indulgent slackening of punishment for sins referred to *temporal* punishment in this life only; the Roman Church now uses the term "Indulgences" with respect to alleviation of or freedom from purgatorial sufferings; in the latter case of freedom from purgatorial pain, they are called "Plenary

Indulgences." The conservative Greek Church, like the Anglican, maintains that Indulgences can relate only to the shortening of the time of Canonical Penance *in this life only*.

For about one thousand years the "godly discipline in the Primitive Church which is much to be desired"—to quote again from the address in the Commination Service—continued to work generally in a healthy and invigorating manner, though as early as A.D. 747 the purchase system had begun, or before that date rather, as it was in that year that the Council of Cloveshoo expressed itself as considering that the buying of remittance from penances by alms to be a new departure and a dangerous precedent.*

In time the abuse became wide-spread. Hugo of S. Victor (1097-1141) went far beyond primitive limits and ideas, distinguishing between the *guilt* of the sinner (which could be done away with, after sincere repentance, by God alone), and the *punishment of the eternal death*, which the Sacerdotal Absolution freed the soul from, in accordance with S. Matthew xviii. 18 and S. John xx. 23.

Richard of S. Victor taught that this punishment, entailed upon all sin, could be softened down into the much less fearful *temporal* punishment of Purgatory.

The following paragraph shows clearly the argument of "The Master of Sentences," Peter Lombard (1164), who said: "In Baptism, all sin is forgiven, and salvation bestowed for Christ's sake; but sins committed after Baptism expose men to the punishment of Divine justice,

* At a Council, presided over by the Archbishop of Mainz, its opinion was thus expressed in the Twenty-sixth Canon, Concil. II.—"Sicuti nova adinventio, juxta placitum scilicet propriæ voluntatis suæ, nunc plurimis periculosa consuetudo est, non sit eleemosyna porrecta ad minuendam sed ad mutandam satisfactionem per jejunium et reliqua expiationis opera a Sacerdote Dei indicta," etc.

and this punishment is inflicted on most men by the fire of Purgatory, but, in accordance with the power given to the Church, she can commute this future punishment into the infliction of temporal chastisement; and, further, upon the fulfilment of certain demands, and in consideration of certain services, she can altogether remit this temporal punishment."

It should in fairness be noted that Peter Lombard plainly taught that such Indulgences can profit those only who, however great their sins of infirmity in this life, yet had a lively faith.

But his scheme became still further a basis for future errors, and for additions to the Catholic faith; in after years the hawkers of Indulgences did not care to inform the purchasers that a living faith was necessary, as well as money.

In time it became possible to pay sums of money instead of undergoing the penances, either to relieve the poor, or to help in the building of Churches: "In process of time, liberal almsgiving was accepted in lieu of, or at least in mitigation of, penance . . . here was a loophole for evil to creep in" (Bishop Harold Browne).

People gradually grew accustomed to, and naturally preferred, the latter system, and if, by the payment of money, another man could be found willing to receive a flagellation instead of the actual penitent, no blame could be attached to the latter, and how this variation from primitive spiritual vigour did chiefly arise we will now place before the reader.

"The *commutation of penance* established a distinction between the rich and the poor totally at variance with the spirit of the Gospel. In the eighth century, a whole year's fasting might be commuted by the purchase of thirty

masses; or, if he preferred a different *investment*, the wealthy delinquent might hire other people to fast in his behalf, and thus *redeem a seven years' penance in three days*" (*cf.* Wilkins' "Concilia"—copied from Hart's "Ecclesiastical Records," p. 326).

In the Council held at Cloveshoo in 747, were presented the Canons of S. Cuthbert; of these the Twenty-seventh shows how the Kingdom of Heaven related to the spending of money by the well-to-do. We give the reading of this Canon, or of part: " . . . We must speak of this more at length, because a certain man, rich in the things of this world, desiring speedy reconciliation for a great crime of his, affirmed in his letter that (as many assured him) his sin was so fully expiated, that if he could live three hundred years longer, although he should seldom or never fast, *it*"—*i.e.*, his sin—"*was remitted in consideration of the psalmody, alms and fasting of other people. . . .*" This shows plainly how people had been taught, or, at least the ideas commonly held, and the necessity of S. Cuthbert's remonstrances. Next we quote from Archbishop Dunstan's "Penitential," A.D. 960 (see Wilkins, I., p. 233, and Hart's "Ecclesiastical Records," p. 337).

"A powerful man, and one who has many friends, may, by the assistance of his friends, very much lighten his penance. A seven years' penance may thus be completed in three days. In the first place, let him take twelve men to assist him, and let them fast three days with bread, water, and green herbs: and to do it completely, let him procure, as well as he can, seven times an hundred and twenty men, each of whom is to fast for three days; and thus will as many days be fasted as there are days in seven years."

These words are from a Church document, not culled from a sarcastic work of the Renascence period, not from the writings of a follower of Boccaccio or Rabelais.

When the Crusades were preached, and every knight was summoned to fight against the Moslem infidels, he of the golden spur, possessing needful coin or its equivalent, who cared not to go to the far-off East, could compound by paying a handsome douceur to the Papal agents, and by sending, if necessary, a substitute.

Thus it happened that the Wars of the Cross helped forward the system of Indulgences with astonishing rapidity.

"The method which the Popes employed to set the Crusaders in motion proved not only at first, but for hundreds of years, to be singularly effectual. The history of the world, we may say, has only one other phenomenon of a similar kind to show us. One of the greatest and most radical changes in the life and views of the Christian world was ushered in by it.

"For a long time previously, through the clerical invention of Indulgences, the primitive institution of penance had been widely diverted from its original object. What formerly had been intended as a religious and moral gymnastic for strengthening the will and weakening the dominion of the senses, had since the ninth century degenerated into a traffic in sins, and served to enrich the Church with money and lands. Subsequently, Gregory VII. had taken upon himself to grant a general remission of sins to the adherents of the rival King Rudolph. But it was not thought prudent to continue in this course. Urban II., however, promised remission of all penances, as well as certain salvation, to all who would join the Crusade, allowing sins to be expiated by Confession and Absolution. In this way the ancient institu-

tion of Penance received its death-blow, not all at once, but in the natural course of things. That which, when the Crusades ceased, was substituted for it was of such a nature that, from an ecclesiastical standpoint, the year 1096 must be described as an ill-omened epoch, and the action of Pope Urban II. in 1095 as an irreparable blow to religion. At a later period, dogma was made to accommodate itself to predominating custom" (Dr. Von Döllinger's "Studies in European History, being Academical Addresses delivered in the Munich Academy." The above quotation is from Lecture VIII., "The Origin of the Eastern Question."*)

The reference to the year 1095 relates to the Act of Urban II. in granting Indulgences—by the Council of Claremont—to Crusaders in these words: "Whosoever for devotion alone, and not for the sake of honour or wealth, shall go to Jerusalem for the liberation of the Church of God, that journey shall be reckoned to him in the place of all penance."

Although there were men of lofty aims and noble thoughts, possessing high rank and station, whose Crusading zeal was the result of heartfelt devotion to their Lord, and of veneration for His Sepulchre, still, a multitudinous riff-raff went forth, slaughtering Jews, and making the camps scenes of the wildest debaucheries, considering that, if slain, they would become martyrs, and at once enter into the glories of Heaven.

In the Primitive Church, a voluntary and open confession prepared the way of atonement. Confession afterwards assumed a private form from fear of scandal. Later on

* Quotations from Dr. Von Döllinger's Lectures are taken from the English translation of Margaret Warre—published by Murray, 1890—a very valuable work.

compulsory confession was ordered, and every sin was duly assessed, and the penance was duly proportioned, and the penance varied in length between forty days and seven years. A strict regimen of fasting, complete abstinence from pleasure and business: the studied disorder of the penitent's dress expressed his humble spirits and intense yearning for a higher state of things. But the soldiery must ever be on duty, the disputation in the Senate House, the need of money, could not be stopped . . . and a strict enforcement of, and submission to, the rigid fulfilment of the penitential laws would have created an almost depopulated desert. A literal accomplishment of penances was indeed impracticable . . . each act was separately numbered, and, in those times of anarchy and vice, a modest sinner might incur a debt of 300 years. His insolvency was redeemed by a commutation or indulgence. One year of penance was appreciated at 26 solidi of silver—about £4 sterling—for the rich; at 3 solidi for the indigent; and these alms were soon appropriated to the use of the Church, which derived from the redemption of sins an inexhaustible source of opulence and dominion. A debt of 300 years, or £1,200, would impoverish a plentiful fortune. When cash was scarce land could be given to the Church in full satisfaction.

Furthermore, you might pay with your skin instead of with filthy lucre, and years of penance could be satisfactorily arranged for by undergoing three thousand lashes, the severity of which might doubtlessly be mitigated by a private arrangement with the flagellators. This corrective physic might be taken vicariously, some other man—in return for what he would consider an equivalent honorarium—undertaking to receive the castigation. The obvious result was

this: the rich man could sin with as much frequency as he desired, might satisfy the demand of penance by procuring an impecunious tough-skinned Sancho Panza.

Those who may wish to read the exact wording of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall" will find it in Chap. LVIII., Vol. XI.; the two preceding paragraphs are somewhat of a paraphrase.

As time went on further distortions of primitive truth displayed themselves, viz., that the Pope of Rome possessed power to grant Pardons or Indulgences to souls arrested in the Romish Purgatory, and that he could make use of "the treasury of merits."

Previously all Bishops—as being husbands of the Church—could give a Pardon for forty days, a Cardinal for one hundred days; the Bishop of Rome—as Pope—could give Indulgences for all sins committed, or about to be committed.

Before the thirteenth century it had been asserted that the Pope of Rome held power over two realms, those of Heaven and of earth, as being God's Vicar.

The Secretary of Pope Symmachus (503) maintained that every rightly and validly elected Pope—evidently some were not—*became a Saint through the imputed merits of S. Peter.*

Fra Augustino Trionfo, Augustinian Monk of Ancona, commissioned by the avaricious Pope John XXII., set forth in a very definite manner the prerogatives of the Roman Pope, in which this power over the world of spirits by the Pontiff was said to be unlimited, that the Pope could open Heaven or close it—in fact, could afford an authoritative passport by which the holder could, and necessarily should, be franked along the whole line, that the said Pope could clear Purgatory of all souls if the living people on earth would consent to act upon and fulfil certain rules and requirements for the acquiring of the necessary pardons—but

the sagacious monk tendered this advice to his superior, that these tremendous powers should not be so lavishly used as to depopulate those regions where souls are imprisoned and suffering "excruciating torments." These powers which enabled the Pope of Rome to cause his writs to run in Heaven and Purgatory were derived from his being the sole residuary legatee of S. Peter, and, consequently, the sole wholesale purveyor of Indulgences; though of course he might commission others and license them to be retail dealers in the same wares.

Dr. Pusey, in his "*Eirenicon*," Part I., p. 202, quotes Amort, the Augustinian Canon (1692-1775), who says: "There are four opinions as to the value of Indulgences to the departed." The *first*—"rejected by almost all theologians—that the Pope has jurisdiction in Purgatory." This, most remark, is contrary to our Lord's limitation, "Whatsoever ye shall loose on *earth*." "The *second*, of some older writers, that Indulgences avail only in the way of deprecation, in that the Church undertakes to pray to God for the soul of a certain departed. The gain then, is this, that the Pope specially prays God, in the name of the whole Church, together with him who gains the Indulgence. The *third*, and most common among theologians, is that they avail by way of payment, in that the Church takes the satisfactory *Merits of Christ and of the Saints*, and pays them to God for the soul which is being purified, and that God is bound to release that soul." The *fourth*, "that they avail by way of payment, but that God is not so bound" (see quotations from Father Sarpi).

As to "the merits of Saints." "It is most truly assured that the treasure of the Church is in the power of the Pope, and that he can communicate its benefits" (for the souls of

the departed in Purgatory), "since, on account of the charity wherein they departed, they are fit objects to receive the benefits of the Church, and thus he can grant them Indulgences and relaxations." "As, by God, *everlasting punishment* is changed into *purgatorial*, so, by the priests, *purgatorial punishment* is changed into *temporal*." "That Indulgences profit the departed who are detained in Purgatory, if applied to them by the Church, is certain, and the contrary is heresy, or most close upon a heresy" (certain Roman writers quoted by Dr. Pusey).

Nevertheless, Sir Thomas More wrote: "Likewise as though the Sacrament of penance be able to put away the eternality of the pain, yet hath the party for all that cause to fear both Purgatory and Hell too—lest some default," etc.

It was by an unnatural forcing, by a subtle misapplication of prayers for the departed in combination with the power of procuring "Indulgences" by payment, and by the novel doctrine introduced by the "Doctor Irrefragibilis," Alexander of Hales, an English monk of the Order of S. Francis (d. 1245); by Albertus Magnus, the Swabian Dominican Monk, the "Doctor Universalis" (1193-1280); and by his pupil the great theologian-philosopher, "the Angelic Doctor," S. Thomas Aquinas (1227-1274), it was by all these that the idea was fostered of "Thesaurus supererogationis Christi et perfectorum," that is to say, "The Treasury of Supererogation of Christ and of the perfected," *i.e.*, of the Saints; the word "supererogation" means "above what is asked," and equals "*the overpayment of a debt.*"

"Alexander of Hales, an eminent Schoolman and a countryman of our own, was the first to discover this treasure hid in the field of the Church—*thesaurus meritorum*

it was called. But what he set forth as a pious opinion, Clement VI. elevated into a dogma (1343), and one which was capable of very excellent service; for indeed the convenience was manifest of drawing bills upon the next world, and getting them honoured in this" (Archbishop Trench).

We will endeavour to explain this term and its application as briefly as possible, and under three heads:—

(1) As to our Blessed Lord. It is, of course, granted by all Christians of thoughtful mind that one single drop of His Precious Blood shed upon the Cross was sufficient to redeem the world; hence, it was argued, all the superabundant, the above-what-was-necessary, quantity of His shed Blood—over and above that all-containing single drop—all this can be taken from this perennial Fountain of Mercy, and applied to the tortured souls in Purgatory. It must be always remembered that the saving quality of His Most Precious Blood is absolutely illimitable, neither the Holy Blood nor Its saving properties can ever come to an end, our Lord's Merits are, of necessity, infinite.

(2) Having referred to the treasury of the Merits of our Lord, we now have to be introduced to another treasury, that containing "the superabundant satisfactions of the Blessed Virgin, who, being exempt from every actual sin, had no satisfaction to pay for herself" ("Declaration of Clement VI.," 1343).

(3) "The satisfactions of the Saints, who, in the holy deeds of their lives, *have paid more satisfaction than their sins required*" ("Declaration of Clement VI.," 1343).

Bouvier (a French Bishop, b. 1783, author of a well-known work, "Traité des Indulgences") writes plainly: "The Blessed Virgin was never stained with sin; S. John Baptist was sanctified in his mother's womb. The great

number of Confessors and Martyrs, of spotless virgins, and mortified anchorites who have passed their whole lives in prayer and fasting, in weeping and sorrow, in discipline and macerations of the flesh, *have offered to God much more abundant satisfaction than they owed to the Divine Justice*" ("Controv. Lectures," II., 71).

Now Dean Hook, in his "Church Dictionary," says: "In treating this subject we will first show what the Romish doctrine is . . . what the Romish doctrine concerning pardons is, it is difficult to determine; they have had so many crotchets about it, that one can scarce tell where to find them. We shall endeavour to explain it in these following propositions:—

"First, They assert, as Bellarmine saith, that 'many holy men have suffered more for God and righteousness' sake than the guilt of the temporal punishment, which they were obnoxious to for faults committed by them, could exact.'

"Secondly, Hence they say, as Johannes de Turrecremata, 'That one can satisfy for another, or one can acceptably perform satisfactory punishment for another, viz., because they suffer more than is due to their own sins; and seeing all sufferings are satisfactory, what they undergo more than is due to their own is satisfactory for other men's sins.'

"Thirdly, 'Seeing they who thus undergo satisfactory punishments for others do not appoint the fruit of this their satisfaction to any particular persons, it therefore,' as Roffensis saith, 'becomes profitable to the whole Church in common, so that it is now called the common treasury of the Church, to wit, that from thence may be fetched whatsoever any others lack of due satisfaction.'

"Fourthly, 'This common treasure,' saith Bellarmine,

'is the foundation of pardons.' So that, as he saith, 'the Church hath power to apply this treasure of satisfaction, and by this to grant our pardons.'

"By this, therefore, we may have some sight into this great mystery, and perceive what they mean by pardons. For as Laymanus the Jesuit saith, 'A pardon or Indulgence is the remission of a temporal punishment due to God without the Sacrament, by the application of the satisfaction of Christ and the Saints.' Or, as Gregorius de Valentia saith, 'An ecclesiastical pardon or Indulgence is a relaxation of a temporal punishment by God's judgment due to actual sins, after the remission of the fault made without the sacrament (of penance), by the application of the superabundant satisfaction of Christ and the Saints, by him who hath lawful authority to do it.' But let us hear what a Pope himself saith concerning these pardons. Leo X., in his decretal, ann. 1518, saith, 'The Pope of Rome may, for reasonable causes, grant to the same Saints of Christ who, charity uniting them, are members of Christ, whether they be in this life or in Purgatory, pardons out of the superabundancy of the merits of Christ and the Saints; and that be used, for the living as well as for the dead, by his apostolic power of granting pardons, to dispense or distribute the treasure of the merits of Christ and the Saints, to confer the Indulgence itself, after the manner of an absolution, or transfer it after the manner of a suffrage.' So that, as Durandus saith, 'The Church can communicate from this treasure to anyone,' etc."

The "Catholic Dictionary" says that Sixtus IV., when bestowing Indulgences on the souls of certain departed, laid down the principle that such Indulgences were given only by "way of suffrage"; by which he meant that "the

Church has no direct power over the souls of the departed, and that she can but humbly pray God to accept the merits of Christ . . . mercifully to remit the whole or a portion of the pains due to the souls suffering in Purgatory." But Popes have claimed an absolutely direct power to lift souls out of Purgatory.

The Fourteenth Article of Religion refers to what we beg to call a "blasphemous fable"—this principle of "the Treasury of Merits" of Saints — under the subject of "Works of Supererogation." "Voluntary works besides over and above God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, 'When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, "We are unprofitable servants."' Cardinal Peronne speaks thus of Indulgences: "est autem indulgentia remissio pœnæ temporalis adhuc post absolutionem sacramentalem peccatis debitæ in foro interno coram Deo valida, facta per applicationem thesauri ecclesiæ a superiore legitimo" (Præl. Theolog. "Tract. de Indulgentiis").

Or, again, by way of explanation, an Indulgence is "A remission by the Church in virtue of the keys or the judicial authority committed to her of a portion or the entirety of the temporal punishment due to sin. The infinite merits of Christ form the fund from whence this remission is derived, but besides, the Church holds that, by the Communion of Saints, penitential works performed by the just beyond what their sins might exact are available to other members of Christ's mystical Body."

The Saints therefore made God a debtor to them; they were so holy, performed such great deeds of love and mercy, that they actually were more holy than the standard of holiness required; whereby they have entered Heaven; in fact they lived over and above God's Commandment. Of course it is not pretended that they acquired to so great a pitch of excellence by their own holiness, but by the Grace of God. What is the requisite quantity and quality of faith and of good works no one ventures to calculate, the superexcellence is above proof. Let us put the matter thus: let us state the necessary qualifications for the acquiring of Heaven as 100 good marks; a Saint of the kind we are now referring to has gained 120 such marks. The extra 20 merit-marks form the balance in favour of this Saint in this strange "treasury" or bank; they are called "superabundant merits." These merits of the Saints form —may we so term it?—a "Savings Bank," of which the Romish official name is "The Treasury of Merits." We can hardly call this system one in which the Saints keep a debit and credit account with the Almighty, because the balance appears to be always in their favour; it has never been stated that any Saint has "no effects." This spare cash lies ready at hand, and he who alone has a right to employ it is the Pope of Rome, God's Vicegerent and sole manager, who applies the surplus to relieving the tortured Spirits and Souls in Purgatory.*

But when we consider that the merits of Christ's Blood

* We beg to draw attention to what the Ecclesia Anglicana said at the Council of Basel (1431), protesting against the Papal interpretation of the words "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth," etc. The document containing the protest was presented by Richard Ullerston. It maintained that these words were to the Church in the persons of those who held the theocratic government and not to be restricted to the Bishops of Rome. The document came to an end with the following words: "Quod utinam quidem crebro

are unending, illimitable, the thought may strike one, "Then why make use at all of the 'superabundant' merits of the Saints, even though they be accepted only through the merits of Christ?"

There is this much truth to be borne in mind, that God *does* hear the prayers of those who strive to serve Him, and the prayers of a righteous man avail much: moreover, the departed Saints are certainly very exalted Suppliants.

The distorted system of Indulgences cannot be traced back to a period anterior to the reign of Gregory VII. (A.D. 1073-1085), when they were offered to all those who would take up arms against the Pope's enemy, Henry IV. of Germany; which happened in 1077-8.

The well-known German theologian, Gabriel Biel (1420-1495), says, that "up to the time of Gregory VII. Indulgences were but little known" (in "Can. Miss. Lect.," 57).

The well-known Morinus (an Oratorian, lived 1591-1659), states that the doctrine with respect to Purgatory does not date back further than the twelfth century.

We have already referred to the decree of Urban II., in 1096, at the Council of Claremont, inciting Crusading zeal by the promise of Indulgences, when it was decreed that the journey to the Holy Land would be deemed as satisfaction for all penance, "iter illud pro omni pœnitentia reputetur."

It was in 1215 that Pope Innocent III. (1198-1216),

allegantes, non tamen in toto intelligentes, non allegarent in contumeliam legis Christi" (Van der Hardt, "Magn. Conc. Const.," I., p. 27, p. 114).

Richard Ullerston was a doctor of Oxford who composed a work at the request of Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury in 1408, in which he freely criticized the Court of Rome. The MS. of this and another work are said to be at Cambridge in the University library, and have been published by Hermann Von der Hardt in a work on the Council of Constance which was put on the index in 1703.

generally so full of tact and moderation, made auricular confession compulsory, and thus aided the system of Indulgences. In the same year, in the Fourth Lateran Council, it was claimed for Papal Indulgences that they would run even in the Court of the Great Assize at the Last Day of Judgment and of Resurrection. The words of Innocent differ somewhat from those of Urban II. in the matter of Indulgences: "We therefore out of that power of binding and unloosing which God has bestowed upon us, however unworthy, indulge to all who shall go in person, being contrite and confessed, the plenary forgiveness of all their sins, and we promise them an augmentation of eternal salvation in the retribution of the just." One hundred and twenty-seven years afterwards we see a further development of the system of Indulgences.

Boniface VIII. (Pope 1294-1303) instituted the "Jubilee." Anyone going to Rome and performing certain pious duties would have "plenary Indulgence." Instead of a perilous journey to the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem the less dangerous and more-easily-performed visit to Rome; which invention reminds one of the remark of Spondanus, "The Pope opened Heaven to people by a shorter, more convenient, method." In the year of the Great Jubilee—1300—we may fix the culminating point of Papal Supremacy; it was at this time that two clerks stood day and night before the Altar of S. Peter, with rakes in their hands, raking in untold wealth.

On the death of Benedict XII. the Cardinals at Avignon elected as his successor, in May, 1342, Pierre Roger Beaufort, henceforth known as Clement VI., who authoritatively promulgated the Scholastic theory of Indulgences, declaring that the Pope of Rome alone held the keys of

"thesaurus supererogationis." * In his Bull for the Jubilee of 1350, we find these words: "Et nihilominus prorsus mandamus Angelis Paradisi, quatenus animam illius a Purgatorio penitus absolutam in Paradisi gloriam introducant."

When we remember how England performed the office of an almost exhaustless milch-cow to the Roman Court, and connect this fact with the system of "Pardons" thus set forth, we need not be surprised that Thomas Gascoigne (1403-1458), thus wrote in his "Loci e libro veritatum": "In the year 1440, Pope Eugenius IV. conceded great Indulgences through all the Kingdoms of Christendom, the collector of the Pope then in England, who received the money for the Letters of Indulgence, was Master Peter de Monte, Master of Arts and Doctor of Laws, a mighty proud Lombard, who, when he was leaving England with an enormous treasure collected by the sale of the Papal Indulgences, swore by the Body of Christ, in the presence of Victor Clement, Doctor of Divinity, 'that Pope Eugenius should never have that money unless he would give him, Peter, a Bull appointing him Archbishop of Milan.'" . . . "At that time in England, certain persons used to buy Letters of Indulgence, and the power of absolving in all cases, for twopence, and some for a pot of ale, and some for an act of sin . . . and some had basketsful of

* At this time the illustrious Petrach, Canon of Lombes and Archdeacon of Parma, lived at Avignon. He shows how "the Italian vice," lust of money, was of rampant growth, and in language unmeasured thus speaks of the Papal surroundings: "All that they say of Assyrian and Egyptian Babylon, of the four labyrinths of the Avernian and Tartarian lakes, is nothing in comparison with this hell. All that is vile and execrable is assembled in this place. God is the only means of escaping from this labyrinth." Also he wrote: "Veritas ibi dementia est, peccandi licentia, magnanimitas et libertas eximia. Stupra, incestus, adulteria, pontificalis lasciviæ ludi sunt." His work, "Sine Titulo," has been recommended to us; see also "Matteo Villani," Book III.

Letters of Indulgence to sell them over the country to any who wished to buy; and when any had bought them, they caused their names to be inscribed on the letters, and people used to say, 'Now is Rome come to our doors'; and people did not use to care about doing evil things, thinking that they could, with the greatest ease, obtain pardon and grace by the concession of the Pope."

We next give a quotation from the "Constitution," published in 1466, by George Neville, Archbishop of York from 1469 to 1476: "Some questors (sellers of Indulgences) with extreme impudence and to the deception of souls, have granted Indulgences to the people from a notion of their own, have dispensed with vows, have absolved from murders, perjuries, and other sins, have remitted what has been stolen for an uncertain sum of money given unto them; have relaxed a third or fourth part of penances enjoined, have falsely affirmed that they have drawn three or more souls of the parents and friends of those who have given them alms out of Purgatory, and conveyed them to the joys of Paradise, have given plenary remission of sins to their benefactors in the places where they were questors, and, to use their own words, have absolved them from all punishment and guilt."

(These two quotations are copied from an interesting article, "Cardinal Kemp," given in "The Church Quarterly Review" for January, 1882, Vol. XIII.). The quoted words were part of the complaint made in a Council of the province of York to Pope Martin V.

Archbishop Neville, in his own person, was an example of Papal rapacity. For he, the younger brother of the great Earl of Warwick, had been appointed Bishop of Exeter when only twenty-three years of age, and when but fourteen

years of age, "the nobility of his descent induced the Pope, Nicholas V., to grant him a *dispensation* for holding a canonry in the Church of Salisbury, together with one in that of York." Dispensation given, of course, meant money—fees, etc.—given to the Pope. Nominated Bishop of Salisbury at the age of twenty-three, and unable to be consecrated until twenty-seven, a Papal Bull was granted him for receiving the profits of the See until he should have reached that age; the Pope's share of these profits must have been large. "Indulgences," etc., meant money to the Papal coffers—the Pope being an ecclesiastical Harpagon, ever ready to cry out, "Ma chère cassette."

The rebellion which arose in Germany, under Luther, concerning the sale of Indulgences, has drawn away from general notice the protests of the Anglican Church ("Ecclesia Anglicana") against the same shameless traffic, and against the hawkers of similar Papal documents.

Simon de Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1375 to 1381 (when he was beheaded for sharing in an insurrection during the early part of Richard II.'s reign), issued in 1378 a Mandate against Indulgence-mongers, called collectors or quæstores, "who, with the greatest audacity, deceiving many souls, and deluding the Christian laity, preach, throughout our diocese and province, Indulgences, and false and frivolous remissions of sin."

In 1384, Courtney, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1381 to 1396, wrote to the Confessor of King Richard II., entreating him to exert his influence with the King, so as to induce him to respect the rights and liberties of the Church.

To the above documents are attached the names of individual people by virtue of their office. We can turn to another and more important publication, that is, "The

Articles of Reformation," presented by the University of Oxford to King Henry V. in 1414.

The following is a brief statement of the events which gave rise to the meeting at Oxford:—

There were actually three Popes in the field, for Alexander V., elected Pope by the Council of Pisa in 1409, died on May 3rd, 1410, aged 71, and was succeeded by John XXIII.; but Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. claimed the Patriarchal Throne in Rome. The history of this period of the Papal schism is somewhat involved. The Council of *Pisa* was convoked in 1409 to settle the matter—very important—as to which of the rival Popes, Benedict XIII. at Avignon, or Gregory XII. at Rome (if either), was the true, valid Pope. The Cardinals, who had convoked the Council, decided that neither Benedict nor Gregory was Pope, and deposed them as being "notorious schismatics and heretics, apostates from the faith, infamous for crimes, and perjured," and elected Peter of Candia as Alexander V.

As already stated, after the death of Alexander V. there were three Popes, or three men claiming to be Pope. To settle the dispute, John XXIII. called a Council, to be held at *Constance* at the end of 1414, which Council lasted for four years. The reformation of the Church was likewise to be arranged, but this subject was continually being postponed.*

In preparation for this Council, a meeting was held at

* As a note, we may add that the Council of Pisa (1409) was convoked "for the due and wholesome *reformation* of the Church." The Council of Constance decreed, on October 30th, 1417, that the Pope the assembly was about to elect, "ought to *reform* the Church in *head* and members, and also the Roman court, according to equity." The Council of Constance, *summoned by a Pope, deposed this same Pope*, John XXIII., in May, 1415 and silenced the other two claimants, Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. For two years there was no Pope, the Council passing decrees and transacting most other business; at the end of this period a Cardinal of the Colonna family was elected as Martin V., in 1417.

Oxford in the same year—1414—at which the University drew up Forty-six Articles for the reformation of the Church, and forwarded them to the King. We give three Articles:—

"*Article VI.* As formerly the children of Israel, from the constant use of it, loathed even manna, the sweet food of angels, so in the present day the grant of Papal Indulgences is so prodigal and lavish, that they are commonly looked upon as mere articles of traffic, and have thus become contemptible and vile; whilst others are rendered *(by this facility of procuring Indulgences)* more prone to sin, and more tardy in bringing forth the fruits of repentance; and therefore it appears expedient to provide a remedy for the premises.

"*Article XXXIV.* Since many parishioners, noble or ignoble, male or female, having committed some vile and detestable crimes, being ashamed to confess to their own curate, receive *(a general)* absolution from some ignorant and illiterate friar; it seems expedient that a remedy should be provided by the Bishops.

"*Article XXXIX.* Whereas the shameless pardoners purchase their vile occupation in farm, like Simon *(Magus)*; sell Indulgences like Gehazi; and profligately squander away their gains, like the Prodigal Son; but, what is still more detestable, although they are not in holy orders, they publicly preach, and falsely pretend that they have a full power of absolving both the living *and the dead* from the guilt and punishment of sin; with other blasphemies with which they cheat and seduce the people, and in all probability draw them down to Hell along with themselves, by giving them vain hopes and a recklessness in sin; let the abuses of this pestilent heresy be obliterated from the thresholds of the Church."

We have elsewhere quoted Chaucer—treating of Relics—we now remind the reader of some lines by this old sarcastic writer on the "pardon-mongers":—

"Now good men God foryeve you your trespas,
And ware you fro ye synne of avaryce.
Myn holy pardon may you all waryshe,
So that ye offre nobles or starlynges,
Other els sylver spones, broches, or ynges.
Boweth your heed under this bulle,
Cometh up ye wyves and offreth of your woll,
Your names here I enter in my rolle anon;
Into the blysse of heven shull ye all gon.
I you assoyle by myn highe powere,
Ye that offren as clene and eke clere
As ye were borne."

But further back yet we can go to see the crass impertinence and gross living of these "collectors of alms."

In the Synod of Exeter, under Peter Quivil, Bishop of Exeter, A.D. 1287, was produced the following:—

"*Cap. XLVII.* The errors and abuses to which the collectors of alms have given rise are sufficiently known to the world, for they are commonly ignorant men of vicious lives, yet feigning themselves to be learned and holy; with a presumptuous audacity they usurp the office of preaching, whilst they are totally ignorant of the Word of God. Amongst other errors, they mendaciously assert that they have many more and greater Indulgences than they really have, that thus they may induce simple persons to give more liberal alms, which they afterwards are not ashamed publicly to squander away in drunkenness and luxury. Wherefore we forbid our subjects to admit any collector of alms without our letters *(commendatory)*, and even then let him not be

permitted to *preach*, but let the parish Chaplains faithfully expound to the people his business, and the Indulgences, as they are set forth in the Papal Bulls. And let them not give credit to forged documents, which they often produce, unless they have been examined by us, and approved by the impression of our seal; and let the money which has been collected be preserved entire till the next chapter of the district, and then be entrusted to a faithful messenger by the ordinary of the place."

Eugenius IV. (d. 1447) told certain Cordeliers, settled in Palestine, that they required no Bulls from him, inasmuch as the extreme sanctity of that region would, in itself, procure for them all Indulgences and merits. By those who did visit certain parts of the Holy Land seven years of Indulgences could be gained. But it is not granted to all men to visit the scenes of our Lord's earthly life. Others, therefore, could obtain equal advantages, or greater. Should you assist at a Pilgrimage at S. John Lateran, on the Festival of S. John the Divine, you could gain 28,000 years of freedom from Purgatory. Should you desire a further extension of grace, this might be procured by kneeling, when the heads of SS. Peter and Paul were exposed to view. The proceeding was certainly worthy of being undertaken, for, by means thereof, you gained no less than a further diminution of purgatorial tortures to the extent of 12,000 years ("Merveilles de Rome," pp. 2 and 7).

The Kalendar by which these periods, or durations, of time were measured, whether by terrestrial, or by that of another place, authority deponeth not; but we presume by the terrestrial, as we are informed that an hour in Purgatory seems to the suffering soul to be as long as a year does to us who are still in the flesh.

The Mendicant Orders likewise benefited much. For, in a work published at Valladolid in 1523—the title of which we translate "A Short Compilation of the Privileges of the Mendicant Orders"—we find that on the Festivals of S. Fabian and S. Sebastian, in the Churches of those Saints, Indulgences for 58,968 years 263 days could be obtained. By visiting the Church of S. Maria del Popolo, 555,293 years and 285 days would be wiped off the tale of one's purgatorial torments.

On S. Matthew's Day, by making attendance at the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, you could obtain Indulgences from Purgatory for the period of 159,290 years and 28 days. In all these spiritual computations one cannot but admire the praiseworthy desire to be strictly, not to say infallibly, accurate. By being present when is exposed that absolutely fraudulent "relic," the handkerchief of S. Veronica, having imprinted on it the Face of our Lord, you can obtain 12,000 years of Indulgences. We cannot tell, at the present moment, the Church at which this function is performed, the same handkerchief being preserved at more than one.

It was this sacrilegious fraud of Indulgences which aroused Luther, and it must be remembered that after he had spoken against them Luther still believed in the Papacy, and that his heresies were of later growth.

Leo X., desiring money for the erection of the present Cathedral of S. Peter at Rome, with its style of Revived Paganism—commonly called "Renaissance" or "Renascence"—sent forth Indulgence-hawkers, of whom the best known are Arcunboldo and John Tetzel — the latter especially. These commissaries of Leo were under the authority of Albert of Brandenburg. By this time the trade

in Indulgences had increased and become an assured means of satisfactory profit to the Papal Court. The Pope was wont to sell pardons at fifty crowns a piece, but eventually their lavish production seems to have caused the usual effect of overstocking the market, and of depressing the Papal trade, for within a hundred years after the time of Leo X., combined with a less appreciation of this kind of ware, they could be purchased for a few pence a piece. As time went on they became a drug in the market. Leo did all he could to recommend his papers, for, in his Bull, dated November, 1518, he claimed to be able to give Indulgences most useful, "either in this life, or in Purgatory"—"sive in hac vita, sive in purgatorio."

Arcunboldo and Tetzel employed monks of evil lives and abandoned manners, who brought Indulgences and dispensations into further disrepute—says Fabroni, speaking of Tetzel—"Pudet referre quæ ipse et dixit et fecit, quasi Legatus e cœlo missus fuisset ad quod libet piaculum expiandum atque purgandum" (see Roscoe's "Life of Leo X.").

Tetzel preached in this strain: "You hear not your parents and other dead ones crying: 'Have mercy, have mercy on me, for the hand of God has touched me. For me in the severest pains and torments, from which you could free us by a slight alms. And you will not! You permit us to lie in the flames, delaying the glory promised us.'"

Again, "Let them observe that, seeing that mortal sins in the whole period of life are almost infinite, they have to endure an infinite punishment in the burning pains of Purgatory" (quoted in Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon," Part I., p. 195).

In their third *gravamen*, the princes assembled at Nuremburg complained to the legate that the vendors of Indulgences undertook to pardon not only the past but *the future* sins of their customers ("noxas præteritas *et futuras* viventium"); and Tetzel audaciously declared: "Se tantam habere potestatem a pontifice, ut etiamsi quis *Virginem Matrem* vitiasset ac gravidam fecisset, condonare crimen *ipse* posset interventu pecuniæ. *Deinde non modo jam commissa verum etiam futura peccata condonabat.*"

Long before this time people had been taught to believe that if a man had committed some terrible crime he could be "shrived of his sins, spiritually pardoned without feeling any repentance, without having made confession, or given reparation. All he had to do was to go to a clergyman, pay him a sum of money for a mass to be said in satisfaction for the heinous crime committed; and this purchased service would restore the criminal to a state of grace—without the necessity of feeling contrition, and without the Sacrament of Penance!"

This is what the celebrated Cajetan wrote:—

"The common error *of many* shows itself in this, that they think that this sacrifice [of the altar] has a certain definite amount of merit or makes a certain definite amount of satisfaction *ex opere operato*, which is applied to this person or to that person."

Bishop Creighton says: "S. Thomas said that, as Indulgences were given out of the treasure of the Church, they were remissions, and not merely commutations; they did not depend upon the devotion, the work, or the gifts of the receiver."

The Roman Catholic historian, Lingard, says—speaking of Tetzel and Co.—"They even taught, *if we may credit the*

interested declamation of their adversary, that every contributor, if he paid on his own account, infallibly opened to himself the gates of Heaven ; if, on account of the dead, he instantly liberated a soul from Purgatory." Lingard makes a reservation here in the italicized words, but—with his general fairness—proceeds to quote not Luther (as we should have expected), but the great Erasmus : "De indulgentiis sic loquebantur, ut nec idolæ ferre possent. Hæc, opinor, moverunt animum Lutheri, ut primum auderet se quorumdam intolerabili impudentiæ opponere."

We may remark, *en passant*, that Roman Bishops have before now refused to admit Papal Indulgences, on their merits, into dioceses. "In 1782 the Bishop of Verona prohibited the clergy of the Tyrol from receiving any Papal Indulgences until he had examined them. In 1785 the Archbishop of Mainz declared all future Papal dispensations to be invalid in his diocese, unless they had been examined and confirmed by his own Vicar-General" ("C. Q. R.," 1889).

That "the Italian vice" of avarice, money-grubbing, was in full vitality and vigour is evident from many statements made during this period. At the Council of Trent itself a very direct sermon was preached by Peter Morcatus, on the Third Sunday after Trinity, 1562 :—

"I frequently hear many of you complaining that kings and princes seize unlawfully the property of the Church. I affirm that the fault is with yourselves. So long as you care more for the benefice than you do for its duties, so long as you are given to avarice and do not minister God's Word and Sacraments *without reward*"—that is to say, without being paid for them—"according to our Lord's command, 'Freely ye have received, freely give,' so long will those in power despise both you and your canons" (quoted from an article,

"Preaching at the Council of Trent," in "Church Quarterly Review" for April, 1878).*

The low view which people had held about Indulgences, as stated by Gascoigne, has been entertained ever since. The following story, whether true or false, serves to show how the subject was made a mark for the shaft of sarcasm. Madame D'Aulnoy, in her work "Voyage en Espagne," printed in 1691, tells the story. The Count of Villa Medina, when in the Church of Notre Dame d'Atoca, gave a piece of four pistoles to a monk who implored alms for the purpose of releasing souls from Purgatory. "Ah, Sir," said the monk, "you have freed a soul from Purgatory!" The Count gave another piece of equal value. "Ah, there's another soul delivered!" The Count gave six more pieces one after the other, the monk, after he had received each coin, exclaiming, "A soul has just left Purgatory!" "Are

* We remember having seen it stated that among the preachers at the Council in 1551 was Professor Paul Passota. In his endeavours to prove the necessity of the two powers—the Pope and the Emperor—he made use of the analogy that the number two so constantly occurs in the world, *e.g.*, Adam and Eve, soul and body, "Lord, here are two swords," "two animals breathe on Him in the stable, the ox and the ass"—that is, the Pope and the Emperor—"between *two thieves* He was suspended on the Cross"—the two spiritual and temporal chief rulers of Christendom.

In former times, the Empire and the Papacy had been "the two lights within the firmament of the Church Militant." At the Jubilee of 1300, Boniface VIII., decked with crown imperial, holding the sceptre, girt with the sword temporal, seated on the throne of Constantine, could exclaim, "I am Cæsar—I am Emperor!" Before, long before, the Renascence, the system of the "Holy, Roman Empire"—"neither holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire"—had fallen into decay (see history of the Hohenstaufen dynasty, etc.). And now the Papacy itself was to lose much of its former brightness; forgeries discovered, *e.g.*, donations, reports of Councils, pseudo-decrees, and many more causes too numerous to mention, produced a flood of contempt mingled with rage. The time was no longer when it could with truth be affirmed that

> "Le monde ébloui contemple avec terreur
> Ces deux moitiés de Dieu, le Pape et l'Empereur."

Interdicts were thunderbolts no longer.

you quite sure, Reverend Sir ? " " Absolutely, they are now in Heaven." " Then return me the money, because, if these souls be in Heaven, they cannot return to Purgatory." But the monk very properly held to the money.

To suggest that such a state of things could happen among English Romanists would be most unfair, most absurd, for they are the pick of their Communion. But this is the sort of thing that was wont to take place in foreign countries. What we maintain is, that in such countries doctrines, beyond the natural sense of even the Council of Trent, are fostered, and the surroundings which correspond.

With respect to the above anecdote the question might arise : " Supposing that souls would really be lifted up from Purgatory by means of such money payment, and supposing that the Count did not believe in the affair, but gave his money in order to test the monk—in which case the Count would not have any proper 'intention'—would those souls be delivered from Purgatory ? "

In 1805 the Bishop of Rome granted "*plenary Indulgence*" to every person who should communicate in a certain Church, on condition that an Altar should be decorated therein in honour of the Blessed Virgin. This is to speak thus : that by, or through, the honour thus paid to the Virgin Mary in that Church, a greater and further-reaching blessing could be obtained when receiving the Holy Communion than would be gained by taking the Blessed Sacrament in a Church where there was no such decoration.

This might lead us to discuss another form of Indulgences, namely, the system whereby special privileges are granted to those who communicate in Churches specially named. One would rather think, one would rather accept as part of the Catholic Faith, as part of the glorious and Divine

Mystery, that the Real Presence is as much a tremendous Fact by one Altar as by any other, the Grace given by the Immortal Life-giving Food as gracious and as complete in one Church as in any other, not more so in any specially named than in others.

Interesting details divulged by miraculous visions can be learned in a work by the Abbé Louvet, born at S. Seine, in Auxois, near Dijon, and died in 1642. See also Migné's "Ecclesiastical Biography." Louvet's work informs us that the saintly Innocent III. (Pope 1199-1206) was seen by S. Lutgard * covered with flames and in torture to be endured until the end of the world! Well might the great Bellarmine exclaim: "This example really fills me with terror" (see "Le Purgatoire d'après les révélations des Saints," par M. l'Abbé Louvet, Paris, 1880).

On April 14th, 1854, Pius IX., bestowed on those who wear the blue scapular of the Immaculate Conception, and say Six Paters, Aves, Glorias in honour of the Trinity and the Immaculate Virgin many Indulgences.

In 1879 plenary Indulgences were promised to those who wore the "Seraphic girdle" and said six Paternosters . . . "thousands of plenary Indulgences, and more than a hundred thousand years of partial Indulgences, and may release thousands of souls from Purgatory."

A methodical writer has computed that a fairly good man commits during fifty years—allowing for ten a day—forty-

* S. Lutgard, born in 1182, became prior of the Benedictine Monastery of S. Stroud in 1205. A life of him was written by Thomas de Cantimpre. From this and other sources we learn that he was honoured by many conversations held with our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, S. John the Divine, the Archangel Gabriel. It is asserted that when he saw Innocent III. in the torments of Purgatory he learnt that that Pope was there on account of three "mortal sins," and had escaped Hell only by intercession of the Blessed Virgin. S. Lutgard died June 16th, 1246.

five thousand sins. Allowing also for the penalty of one day of Purgatory for every single sin, the soul must be tortured for one hundred and twenty-three years, three months, and a few days. But to these souls, so intense are their pains, that every hour appears as a century.

We have eliminated from this chapter an account and contents of the "Sabbatine Bull," said to have been issued by John XXII. in 1322, in which it was promised that every one who had worn a particular Scapulary would be released from Purgatory by the Blessed Virgin on the *Saturday* after death.

There is every probability that this document is a forgery, fabricated by a monk of the Carmelite community for the purpose of aggrandizing his society.

Benedict XIV. and the learned Bollandist Papebroch, would not accept this Bull as genuine and authentic; but they both seem to accept as a fact the apparition of Saint Simon Stock.

A well-known authority writes thus to us at the close of a communication, in which he shows argument against the genuineness of the Bull: "Again, the whole attitude of the Carmelites with respect to the matter is suspicious. I sometimes think that to the Carmelite mind the mystical is so intensely real that it can hardly realize the conditions of literal truth."

The name "Bull" is derived from the Latin "*bulla*," a boss or seal, or from the Italian "*bollare*," to apply a seal to stamp. "Sabbatine" comes from the Latin for Saturday, "Sabbatum."

We now speak of "Scapulary," which is a piece of cloth worn on the shoulders, part of a monastic habit; from Latin *scapulæ*, *scapularum*, meaning the shoulder-blades, hence, the

back. A small religious emblem goes by the same name, the wearer thereby signifying an intense devotion to the Blessed Virgin.

The Scapulary of our Lady of Carmel owes its origin to an early foundation, the Blessed Virgin having appeared to S. Simon Stock—General of the Carmelites in the West—in Cambridge, on July, 16th, 1251. The privilege connected therewith was that the person who might be wearing the Scapulary at the moment of death would be preserved from the eternal fires of Hell. Concerning which thing the author of this French treatise on Indulgences, remarks: "We believe that Mary, in order to make good her promise, will draw for the wearers, as from a well, those divine treasures, of which she is the trustee, the necessary graces to enable them to persevere in the way of uprightness, or to assist in their sincere repentance, and so strengthened, or purified and reconciled to God by the Sacraments, or by the fruits of perfect repentance, the associates of the Scapulary, dying in this holy garment shall not fall beneath the blows of inexorable justice."

A full account of Scapularies, and so forth, may be found in "Le Chrétien éclairé sur la nature et l'usage Des Indulgences, par le Père A. Maurel de la Compagnie de Jesu." The copy lying before us is of the eleventh edition, published by J. B. Pélagand, Lyons and Paris, 1864.

One can understand that the above Scapulary must be added to, and indeed so we find. For in the seventeenth century, our Blessed Lord appeared, as also the Blessed Virgin, to the Venerable Ursula Benincasa. To be more explicit, we should say that the Virgin appeared with the Infant Jesus in her arms, she being clothed with a white garment, and over this a blue garment. After some words

of the Virgin, our Lord ordered a society of women to be formed, which should be known as that of "*The Immaculate Conception.*" While in this trance Ursula saw many angels holding blue Scapularies, which they presently let fall on the earth.

The Article protests against the exaggeration of the popular preacher; what his teaching was is, to a certain extent shown by the contents of the Bull just referred to, and to be found in such narratives of which we have just given an example.

It appears that there is the "Red Scapulary, or of the Passion." The account of its introduction constitutes an interesting little anecdote. Our Blessed Lord appeared to a Sister of Charity on the Eve of the Festival of S. Vincent de Paul, in the year 1846. Our Saviour held in His Hands a Scapulary, whose two pieces of red woollen material were attached to two strings of the same material and colour. Upon one side was represented the Crucifixion, the instruments of the Passion, and the words: "Sainte Passion de Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, sauvez-nous." On the reverse side were representations of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, with words which we translate, viz.: "Sacred *Hearts* of Jesus *and Mary* protect us." Our Lord appeared again to the same Sister on the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross in 1846, when she was informed that for those who wore "these precious liveries of the Passion" great increase of faith, hope, and charity, was reserved every Friday.

Either such stories as these are published with authority or without. If the former, then to what shifts is the Roman Church driven; if not, then it is evident that the Church of England is not the only one in which individual freedom of speech is far from being under a sensible control.

Nowhere can we find stronger denunciation of the purgatorial doctrine and of its consequential worldly venal abuses than in the work of Fra Paolo Sarpi* on the Council of Trent, himself a member of the Church of Rome. He shows the causes of the rise and progress of the Romish doctrines of Purgatory and *Indulgences*. Leo X. was in need of money, and, as a means of obtaining it, he thought to serve himself of Indulgences as a fountain from whence to draw. "This manner of gaining money was put into practice after the year 1100. For Pope Urban the Second granted a plenary Indulgence and remission of all sins to all who made war in the Holy Land . . . and was imitated by his successors for many hundreds of years; some of which (as always new inventions are enlarged) granted it to those that maintained a soldier, in case they could not, or would not, go to the war themselves in person. . . . Leo the Tenth, counselled by the Cardinal of San Quatro to follow these examples, sent an Indulgence and pardon for sins throughout all Christendom, granting it to all those who would give money, and extending it even unto the dead; for whom when the money had been paid, his will was that they should be freed from the pains of Purgatory. . . . Having published an universal grant of Indulgence, in the year 1517, he distributed part of the harvest, before it was reaped or

* Father Paul Sarpi, born in that anti-papal city Venice, lived between 1552 and 1623. He had a personal acquaintance with Olivo, formerly secretary to the Papal legate at the Council of Trent. He (Sarpi) also enjoyed the protection of the great Cardinal Borromeo, himself naturally an authority on matters connected with the Council. "Sarpi's services to mankind are now acknowledged by all except the most extreme Ultramontane partisans" ("Enc. Britt."). Sarpi, like his opponent Pallavicini, is not always correct, and both are inclined to partisanship.

His murder having been attempted by bravos—emissaries of the Jesuits—the Republic of Venice granted him a bodyguard. His last words were: "Let us go to S. Mark's"—and fixing his eyes on a Crucifix thus he passed to his rest.

well sown, giving unto divers persons the revenues of divers provinces, and reserving some also for his own exchequer. In particular, the Indulgences of Saxony, and of that arm of Germany which reaches from thence to the sea, he gave to his sister Magdalen, wife unto Francesco Cibo, bastard son of Innocent the Eighth; by reason of which marriage, this Leo was created Cardinal at the age of fourteen years, which was the first beginning of Ecclesiastical greatness in the House of Medici. And Leo used this liberality, not so much through brotherly love, as to make up to the family of Cibo for the expenses which it had incurred when he himself had retired to Genoa, not daring to abide in Rome as long as Alexander the Sixth had linked himself with the Florentines, who, being enemies to the House of Medici, had chased it out of Florence. The sister (in order that the Pope's gift might be in reality a profitable one to her) committed the care of preaching, the *Indulgences*, and exacting the money unto Bishop Aremboldus. . . . This man gave power to publish the Indulgences to whomsoever promised to raise most profit by them without any regard of the quality of the persons. . . . The Pardon-mongers, ministers of Aremboldus . . . went to the Dominican Friars in Saxony. These Friars, in publishing the Indulgences, desiring to magnify the value of them more than others had done before, spake many strange things, which gave cause of scandal. Whereunto was added the bad lives of the Pardoners, who in taverns, and elsewhere, in games, and other things not fit to be named, spent that which the people spared from their necessary expenses, to purchase the Indulgences. By these means Martin Luther, an Eremite Friar, being stirred up, began to speak against the Pardoners. . . . The doctrine of Indulgences having not been

well examined in former ages (and people had never considered how Indulgences might be defended and maintained, or how contended against) the essences and causes of them were not well understood. Some thought they were nothing but an absolution or freeing (made by authority of the Prelate) from penance which the Church in most ancient times imposed by way of discipline, upon the penitent (which imposition was assumed in succeeding ages by the Bishop only, afterwards delegated to the penitentiary priest, and finally left wholly to the will of the Confessor), and that they (the Indulgences) did not deliver us from paying the debt due to the Justice of God. Others thinking that this brought more hurt to Christians than benefit, who being delivered from Canonical punishments, became negligent to satisfy the Divine Justice with voluntary penance, began to be of opinion that they set us free from both the one and the other; but these were divided. Some thought that they set us free, though nothing were given in recompense for them. Others abhorring that opinion, said, that by reason of the mutual participation in charity of the members of Holy Church, the penance of one might be communicated unto another, and free him from this compensation. But because it seemed that this was more proper to men of an holy and austere life than to the authority of Prelates, there arose a third opinion, which made Indulgences in part an absolution, because authority was necessary for them, and in part a compensation. But as the Prelates did not lead such lives as that they could have any 'merits' to spare for the benefit of other people, there was made a treasury in the Church full of the merits of all those who had more of them than would serve their own turns, the dispensation whereof is committed to the

Pope, who, when he giveth Indulgences, maketh up for the debt of the sinner, by assigning so much in value out of the treasury. Neither then was there an end to the difficulties; for it was opposed that the merits of the Saints being finite and limited, this treasury might be diminished. Wherefore desiring to make this treasury inexhaustible, they added the Merits of Christ, which are infinite. Whence arose a doubt as to the need at all of the little drops of the merits of others, when there existed an infinite Ocean of the Merits of Christ; hence, some were greatly given to the opinion that the treasure consisted of the Merits of our Saviour alone" (see Father Paul Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent," Book I., pp. 4-6).

Archbishop Trench of Dublin (d. 1886) in his "Lectures on Mediæval Church History," p. 336, makes some remarks concerning the system: "There was indeed an evident misgiving for a while about declaring that to the Church had been committed the keys of the Middle World, which is neither Heaven nor Hell; that the Church could thus remit the pains, not by herself imposed, of Purgatory. Before long, however, all scruples on this head were set aside—the domain in which Indulgences availed being thus immensely enlarged. Nor did matters stop here. In 1477 Sixtus IV. declared that Indulgences had a retro-active value, might be obtained by the faithful not for themselves only, but for the relief of *such as had already departed and were now passing through, but had not finished yet, the discipline of those cleansing fires.* It is easy to understand what an appeal there was here to some of the best and strongest affections of the human heart. Who could endure selfishly to withhold, for some private gratification, that which, if rightly laid out, might mitigate or abridge the anguish of a parent, a child,

a wife, a husband, and deliver from pains which—as they were now often described—differed little, save only in their temporary character, from the sufferings of the lost."

And it was partly by appeal to loving hearts that Tetzel caused the coins to fall to the bottom of his money-box, from which moment, according to that fraudulent pedlar, the soul for whom the money was paid was lifted from the tortures of Purgatory to Heaven!

It was in its Twenty-second Session that the Council of Trent treated of the subject of Indulgences. The matter was examined by the nine Prelates who had previously professed to have made a thorough investigation of the purgatorial system. The Council did not dare to handle the matter of Indulgences with much exactness, the greater part being desirous of avoiding the subject in order not to be beset by difficulties. Some wished that the subject should be discussed, otherwise the Protestants might affirm that it had been shirked because there existed no sure ground whereon the system of Indulgences could be based. Others hoped that the matter would be mentioned, but with respect to its use only, and to take away the abuses which the corruptions of the times had introduced. "Five Churches said that if these points of doctrines, and the *abuses* of *relics*, *images*, and *Purgatory*, were not taken away, the Synod would be quite ashamed." The decree was read on December 3rd, 1563, formulated by the Bishop of Modena chiefly, that "the Church may grant Indulgences, and hath done so in all times, and that they are profitable for the faithful who do faithfully receive them, that they are proved by Scripture, their continual use by Apostolic tradition, and authority of Councils, and the perspicuity of the whole matter by the uniform doctrine of the Schoolmen" (*cf.* Sarpi).

This may be true, but the Indulgences of the Papal system were not of the same character as those original ones of the Early Church, which latter, moreover, were confined, in their effects, to *this* world.

The Greek-Catholic and Russian-Catholic Churches are in accordance with the English-Catholic Church. Those Churches (conservative on most points), diminished when necessary the severity, or shortened the time, of Canonical penance in *this* life, but did not profess to carry it through the Intermediate State.

"Oftentimes in Roman errors we have the blurred reflexion of Christian truths, and nowhere more noticeably than here; for what is this but a broken and distorted reflexion of a very glorious truth—of this namely, that in Christ there are treasures of grace unexhausted and inexhaustible, that the Church of which He is the Head is indeed one body, a communion of Saints, so that no member of it lives for himself alone, but the good of one becomes in a most real, though mysterious, way the common good and property of all" (Archbishop Trench).

The Russian-Catholic Priest, Wladimir Guettée, in his "Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique Orthodoxe," when speaking of Confession, Indulgences, and such like, says: "The Church of Rome has erred . . . she has changed completely the nature of Indulgences . . . by pretending, in fact, that the power of the Pope extends to the souls in Purgatory, that he can deliver them from their pains, either the whole or part, by the application of Indulgences either partial or plenary. This doctrine rests, firstly, on the false notion of the merits of the Saints, which are found confused with those of Jesus Christ (qui se trouvent pêle-mêle avec ceux de Jesus Christ) in the pretended

treasury of the Popes. This first point is opposed to the Catholic doctrine of the Redemption. The Roman doctrine also rests on the principle of imputed merit ('Imputatif, terme de théologie. Qui est relatif à l'application des mérites de Jesus Christ.' Littré's 'Dictionary'), according to the will and disposition of the Pope, a principle quite opposed to the Catholic idea of justification and penance. In fact, if the superabundant merits of Jesus Christ and of the Saints be *imputed* to us by the Papal will, one can dispense with the laborious tasks of penance, which, through Jesus Christ, obtain justification. . . . It is difficult to understand how the (Romish) doctrine of Purgatory can subsist side by side with that of Indulgences, which can be applied to the needs of those souls suffering in that place. Since it depends but on the Pope to deliver these souls, why is he so cruel as to allow them to continue in such torments? True charity should make such a merciful act appear to him as a duty, a duty incumbent on his sovereign power to cause Purgatory to be a useless place, there being no longer any reason for its existence."

The opinion of the Eastern Catholic Churches was also shown in the Reunion Conference held at Bonn in Sept., 1874.

At the Fourth Conference, held September 15th, were present: Dr. Reeikins, Old Catholic Bishop; Dr. Von Döllinger, Professor of Theology at Munich, a celebrated scholar and historian; Dr. Johannes Janyschew, Rector of the Clerical Academy at S. Petersburg, who, with Dr. Theodor Von Sukhotin and Arsenius Jatschaloff, formed the Russian Catholic element; Dr. Howson, Dean of Chester; Dr. Liddon; Dr. John Kerfoot, Bishop of Pittsburg, North America; Dr. Zeios Rhossis, a Professor of the Greek Catholic Church, and others.

Dr. Howson having accepted the thesis concerning the practice of confession of sins before the congregation or a priest, together with the Power of the Keys, as being of the Primitive Church, the following discussion, or exhibition of consensus of opinion, took place :—

"*Döllinger :* The next thesis is as follows : 'We agree that "Indulgences" can only refer to penances actually imposed by the Church herself.'

"*Sukhotin :* This phrase is open to misconstruction. We know nothing in the Eastern Church of the Roman theory of Indulgences. Our Church has only *personal* Indulgences for the remission of a penance imposed on an individual.

"*Döllinger :* I am not surprised to find that our brethren of the Eastern Church, to whom the Roman system of Indulgences is unfamiliar, do not enter into the meaning of the thesis. It is directed against the idea that Indulgences can remit, not only the punishments and penances inflicted by the Church, but also the temporal punishments for sin, supposed to be due even after Absolution, and that these Indulgences operate both in this life and in the life to come. The thesis will especially exclude all idea of a remission of penances beyond the grave.

"*Janyschew :* We attach no such meaning in our Church to the idea of 'Indulgences.'

"The thesis was accepted."

We conclude this chapter with some remarks of Makary (or Macarius), Bishop of Vinnitza :—

"Indulgences, as understood in Romish teaching, are not by any means based either upon Holy Scripture or upon holy tradition ; moreover, they are pernicious by their influence upon the Christian life : they diminish true repentance for sin : void of discernment, without sense of proportion,

they snatch away from sinful men those means indispensable to the curing of their spiritual sickness, and—by seducing people through the enticement of an easy reconciliation with God and the Church—they contribute, as indeed they have in the past, to a general depreciation of morals" (*cf.* Fleury, Fourth Discourse on "Ecclesiastical History").

"We refrain from speaking concerning many abuses of the Roman Church, abuses which have been committed, and which it will always be possible to commit, in connection with the distribution of Indulgences" (*cf.* Fleury, VI.).

NOTES IN CONNECTION WITH CHAPTERS III. AND IV.

Not the "Sacrifice of the Mass," but "the Sacrifices of Masses," for the faithful departed, are objected to, and the *trade* connected therewith, at so much a Mass, *e.g.*, as protested against in a Council of Durham under Richard, Bishop of Durham, in 1220:—

"We strictly prohibit the sale of Masses; and that the laity be not obliged to give or leave anything by will for the celebration of annual or triennial Masses. We forbid also Priests to load themselves with such a multitude of these annual *(commemorations)* as they cannot honestly accomplish, or which may oblige them to hire other priests for the purpose."

Notwithstanding the fact that Early Fathers, primitive Liturgies, etc., speak in favourable terms of the practice of praying for the faithful departed, and especially at the time of the Eucharistic Service, yet some may object to prayers of this nature, because one of the Articles seems to prohibit such at the time of the Eucharist; we therefore speak of this in a note.

Article XXX. of 1552-3 speaks against the "Sacrifices of Masses," and Article XXXI. of 1562-3 and 1571—Latin and English—refer to these "Missarum Sacrificia"—not "Missæ Sacrificium" in the singular, be it noticed, "the Sacrifice of the Mass," but in the plural—and we read: "Wherefore the Sacrifices of Masses, *in which it was commonly said* that

the Priestes *did offer Christe* for the quicke and the dead, to have remission of *pain or gylt* were *blasphemous* fables, and dangerous deceits."

In transcribing this Article we have put certain words in italics.

First, "*blasphemous*," *i.e.*, forged.

Secondly, "*in which it was commonly said.*" There had been for many years a popular, but erroneous, idea among the people that the Roman Church taught that Christ was sacrificed in the Eucharist in the same quality and manner in which He had been sacrificed on the Cross in His perfectly human, or natural, Body; so says the Article: "Wherefore the Sacrifices of Masses, in which it was *commonly* said that the Priest did offer," etc.

That such was the popular, therefore vulgar, error is shown by reference to various ecclesiastical authors and historians.

(A) It is not against the Offering of the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ in a real, spiritual, supralocal manner that the Article protests, but *against the vulgar error that the Eucharistic Sacrifice was offered in the same manner as upon Calvary*, so many persons imagining that "*Sacrifice*" must mean an offering connected with *human, natural blood-flowing;* the Article does not protest against an "*Unbloody Sacrifice*" pleading for the faithful departed, nor against the Offering of the "Lamb as It had been slain"; we are told, in the "*Black Rubric*," that our Lord's "Natural Body and Blood are in Heaven, and not here." Now, S. Thomas Aquinas wrote: "Christ's Body is locally in one place only, that is to say, in Heaven."

(B) Our Lord's Body is "in loco" in Heaven, filling up a certain amount of place there, Which is *natural* to Its spiritual surroundings, *visible to the Angelic Host;* and perhaps to departed Saints, who are indeed exalted suppliants.

His Body in the Eucharist is a spiritual and real Body substantially present, not bound by and confined within one place at the same time as a natural body is so bound and confined: yet, where the consecrated Bread and Wine are not His Body and Blood are not. Here on earth our Lord is everywhere present at all times as Spirit and God—as He was before He took the Manhood into God, "not by confusion of *Substance*, but by unity of Person"—but since His Resurrection and Ascension His Presence as glorified Man is to be found on earth in the Eucharistic Service only, and then only after certain words in the Prayer of Con-

secration. His Presence then on earth is *spiritual*, and so is *not natural* to our world of sinful and decaying nature, therefore His Presence thus contrary to Its surroundings is here "supernatural," and *not "an object to the senses of man"*; yet are His Body and Blood *substantially* present. The "Judicious Hooker" says: "The power of the Ministry bringeth God Himself down from Heaven." So many people think that "*substance*" means something solid; not so; though a reality it is an abstraction: moreover, it need not necessarily require or imply the occupation of place. Discussions of this nature may be sometimes necessary; they are certainly baleful by nature. "Curious and sharp-witted" people have discussed transcendental mysteries. Let us in simple faith accept such mysteries; when all things shall be made clear in Eternity, mountains shall have been removed, and—God grant it—we shall *see* with a sight not natural, with a vision spiritual.

Against the vulgar error just referred to in (A) the Roman Church protests as much as does the Anglican; the Roman Church does *not* hold that it is the Natural Body of Christ Which is offered up in the Mass; moreover, the Romish error of Transubstantiation does not make for teaching the popular error which was indeed "commonly said." It must not be forgotten that the English Reformers thus styled the Communion Service in the First Edwardian Prayer Book of 1549: "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." "The Mass" and the Communion were the same thing; but for many years before the Reformation the "Communion" aspect of the Divine Mysteries had been lost sight of, and only the Sacrificial aspect thought of.

We have no particular fancy for the title "The Mass"; its origin is either unknown, or else paltry, "Missa est congregatio." Except from custom this name expresses nothing in itself; Shakspeare uses the word in "Romeo and Juliet," Act IV., Scene I., when Juliet says to the Friar: "Or shall I come to you at evening Mass?" like to what we call "Evensong."

"The Mass of the Greek Church" is a term often used, and she is—in connection with the Russian—a vast communion, and one strongly objecting to much that is Roman and Romish; although employing the word "transubstantiation" she does not do so in the same sense as does the Roman. Although we have "The Mass," we think the names "Eucharist" and "The Holy Mysteries" to be better; but we cannot

consent to be deprived of the right to use the term "Mass." The title Eucharist is found in 1 Cor. xiv. 16—in the original Greek "Eucharistia"—so is quite "a Bible word"; the name "Holy Mysteries" occurs in our Communion office.

And we repeat that the Roman Church does *not* teach that in the Sacrifice of the Eucharist our Lord's *Natural* Body is offered in a natural and bloody manner; she no more teaches this carnal Sacrifice and carnal Presence than does the Church of England.

But here we part company with her: we protest against the idea that the Sacrifice in the Eucharist of the Mass is offered up for the faithful departed in order that they may "have remission *of pain and of guilt.*"

The Romish Church teaches that the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar can be offered up in order that the pains of the faithful in "Purgatory" (in Romish sense) may be alleviated; this we do not teach.

The point lies in this, not that the Eucharist may not be celebrated for the faithful departed, but that It must not be offered that they may "*have remission of pain and of guilt.*"

To return again to the nature of the Sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist:—

"The phrase 'Sacrifices of Masses' has nothing to do with the other phrase, 'the Sacrifice of the Mass.' The former describes an error which had obtained great prevalence at the Reformation period—viz., that the Sacrifice of Mount Calvary atoned for the original sin of mankind, but that their actual sins were atoned for by the Sacrifices of Masses. The Article was intended to assert the truth that there never has been but one real propitiatory Sacrifice, and that, therefore, that of the Eucharist was not independent of that of Mount Calvary. It does not say anything as to the sense in which we may speak of the Eucharist as a Sacrifice, but is concerned with ruling out one sense in which we may not" ("The Church Times").

Nowhere is it said in Article XXXI. that "Masses" (for the departed) "are blasphemous or dangerous deceits"—"*blasphema figmenta.*" If we, with unprejudiced mind, will examine this Article, we shall see that these blasphemous deceits consisted in the teaching that Masses form sacrifices for sin apart from the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the *perniciosæ impostura* grew out of the vulgar belief that our Lord's Death on the Cross made satisfaction for *original* sin only, and that Masses—in which the Sacrifice of Christ was continually repeated—were necessary for the

remission of *actual* sin: hence the *traffic* in Masses, at so much per Mass, especially in connection with votive Masses for the departed. It is for the sake of clearness that we have given way to reiterations.

In a letter written to "The Guardian" (October 5th, 1896), Father Puller, of S. John's, Cowley, refers to the error just mentioned, and gives us the words of certain Roman writers who bear witness that such erroneous, nay heretical, teaching was taught: "The Dominican, Ambrosius Catherinus, was one of the leading divines at the Council of Trent. In recompense for the work he did there he was made first Bishop of Minori and afterwards Archbishop of Conza; he died when he was on his way to Rome to receive a Cardinal's hat. Yet his views about the Eucharistic Sacrifice were most astounding. His fellow Dominican, Melchior Canus, says:—

"'From this time we may understand how insane was the opinion of Ambrosius Catherinus, who taught that sins committed before Baptism are remitted through the Sacrifice of the Cross, but all post-Baptismal sins through the sacrifice of the Altar.'"

Bishop Gardiner, of Winchester, in a sermon preached on S. Peter's Day, 1548, used these words:—

"When men added to the Mass an opinion of satisfaction, or of a *new* redemption, they put it to another use than it was ordained for."

In the same letter Father Puller gives two senses in which the adjective "*propitiatory*" may be used; that Cranmer and Gardiner, in their dispute with each other, used the adjective in a different sense, and each in a right sense.

After which we read the following in "The Guardian": "The Spanish Jesuit, Vasquez, one of the greatest authorities among the later Schoolmen, expresses himself as follows:—

"'Some of the more modern authors have *openly taught* that, by the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in so far as it is a sacrifice offered to the Father, not only the venial sin of those for whom it is offered, but also their mortal sin is blotted out according to their disposition, *ex opere operato*, as if they had had the sacrament of penance ministered to them; so that, to effect this blotting out, simple attrition suffices in him for whom the Mass is offered; and by virtue of the sacrifice, which produces results similar to those of the sacrament of penance, without any operation of the will, the grace of the remission of sins is always proximately conferred.'"

CHAPTER V.

Concerning Invocation of Saints.

IN the edition of the Canons and Decrees already referred to—that published in Paris by J. Leroux Jouby and Co., 1848 — on pages 218 and 326 we find the passages referring to the Invocation of Saints.

There is nothing that an English Catholic can object to in what the Council decreed about Masses in honour of the Saints; the reader is told that to God alone is the Sacrifice offered, that the celebrant never says: "I offer this Sacrifice to Thee through Peter or Paul," but glorifies God for their victories, and prays that they whom we commemorate on earth may be considered worthy to intercede for us in Heaven. When we say that this wording cannot properly be objected to, we may make an exception to the statement that the Saints are in Heaven, according to the Roman sense. Later on, we refer again to the Decrees, remarking on the gentle and moderate wording of the Decree relating to this subject.

In the Catechism of the Council of Trent (Buckley's translation) the subject occupies about four pages. Question VIII. states that when angels in the Bible-narrative refused worship, they refused to be worshipped with that

supreme worship due to God alone. And we think that this must be so, because that angelic messenger who stands in the presence of God, or who receives from God messages to be transmitted by him to men who shall be heirs of salvation, to such an one an honourable reverence must surely be due.

Question X. seems to us to be very weak in its argument, which is that "Angels are to be invoked," not only for the reason just mentioned, but because Jacob after his wrestling with the Angel begged his blessing and also that of Him whom he did not see. No quotation from any Early Father or Schoolman is given here in proof of the assertion.

Question XI. asserts truly that to honour the Saints and Reliques does not detract from the honour due to God. Upon which we venture to remark that the Catholic method of such honouring does not detract from God's glory, but that the method and custom of honouring Saints and Reliques in foreign countries under the Roman obedience *does* diminish the glory directly of our Saviour.

Question XII. concludes with an axiom: "Will not the citizens of Heaven aid also penitent sinners by their prayers? Will they not, when asked, implore the pardon of our sins and conciliate for us the favour of God?"

To doubt this would be to refuse acceptance of a very important section of the Creed which speaks of "The Communion of Saints." But to ask the Saints for the assistance of their prayers, and to fly to them for succour in the way and wording quoted below, are quite different systems.

Questions XIII. and XIV. assert that invoking—*i.e.*, calling upon—the Saints to pray for us does not proceed from any diffidence in the Divine Aid or from Weakness of

Faith. Under Catholic conditions this is true enough. But when authors duly authorized by Roman authorities absolutely assert that "the throne of Grace" in Heb. iv. 16 is S. Mary the Virgin, that practically the Virgin is more merciful than our Lord, then the most charitable view we can take of these assertions is that such teaching goes beyond that which the Council of Trent intended, or else that such invocations are the result of diffidence in the aid of Jesus Christ.

But we have frequently noticed that although a Canon or definition in the Church of Rome may be worded in a primitive and Catholic manner, yet the Romish application in daily life goes much beyond the plain intelligent reading.

Inasmuch as the Romish sentiment concerning Invocation of Saints is largely founded on the power they possess with God by reason of their superabundant "merits," it is natural that this subject should follow immediately that part of the principle of Indulgences spoken of in our last chapter.

But it must not be that carelessly and without due distinction we use the term "Invocation," for it has more than one meaning—there is "Invocation" and "Invocation," the former if unnecessary certainly permissible, the latter unprimitive, dangerous, harmful.

"The 'Invocation' condemned in the Article is that form thereof which trenches upon ground properly belonging to God alone, and which popular Roman teaching and practice so frequently invade.

"But the Church of England nowhere directly forbids that oblique form of prayer (as distinct from the direct prayer) which may be termed 'comprecation,' though it has never been encouraged for reasons which are obvious" ("The Church Times").

We may consider "Invocation" under three heads. A fourth aspect—namely, when we call upon the departed in a merely poetic or commemorative manner, as when in the "Benedicite" we sing, "O Ananias, Azarias and Misael"—this aspect, we venture to think, needs no remark.

First. Calling upon God by praying to and worshipping Him, calling upon our Blessed Lord to offer up our prayers to the Father, lawful and necessary, needs no comment.

Second. Calling upon the Saints, asking them to pray for us, not unlawful but not absolutely necessary. There are doubts as to whether they have cognizance of us; if they have and hear our invocations, have they cognizance of, and do they hear us, at all times? If not, when? And what are the laws which enable them to hear occasionally or frequently but not always? Perhaps beneficial; some amount of authority for this; to some races and minds this invocation causes additional fervour and devotion, but to such as these Invocation of Saints may be harmful, as leading to exaggeration, and so passing lawful bounds.

From which arose the *third* form, viz., invoking the Blessed Virgin, S. Joseph, or Patron Saint, that they should offer our prayers to God, and asking them to bestow gifts upon us, salvation and such like—unlawful, un-Catholic, unprimitive. "Until about five hundred years after Christ the practice was not in any sort admitted into the public Services" (Bishop Hall).

In the very early years of the Christian Church the word "saint"—sanctified, consecrated to God as His children and servants—was applied to all faithful Christians, and not in that contracted sense in which lengthy time has accustomed us to use it. But by the time of Irenæus and Tertullian the word began to be used as a title of honour to those who

had died the death of martyrs witnessing to the truth of Christianity, sealing their faith in their own blood; to those who had exhibited a wondrous living faith, or led exceptionally holy lives.

It was both seemly that in those early times—especially in the periodic persecutions—the bodies of the faithful, particularly of slain martyrs, should be carried to the catacombs and treated with all possible care and devoted love.* In the case of the ordinary departed (when on account of the necessary privacy the Services of the Church were held in these gloomy subterranean passages) it was natural that the spot chosen for the last resting place should be nigh the tomb of some martyr. It followed naturally also that lights, necessary for the performance of Divine Service, should stand by, or on, such tombs; the location of such lamps or candles speaking to the worshippers through symbolism. For they draw attention to the "rest in hope" of those who had indeed let their "light shine before men" through the grace and love of God; the survivors received greater strength in the battle, a greater power of rejoicing amid the heathen gloom, a fuller faith wherein to glorify the Author and Finisher of their Faith; the blood of the Martyrs did prove to be the seed of the Church. By the second half of the second century Martyrs were commemorated at their tombs, and the days of their deaths were called their "birthdays," because at their deaths they had entered into the higher life of the spirit-world. Eusebius tells us that in the Church at Ephesus the Christians did thus commemorate the death of the aged

* But it is evident that in process of time people who had never been martyrs were called such. In one of the "Capitularies" (*i.e.*, "little chapters") of Charles the Great, the warning was written: "Beware of venerating the names of martyrs falsely so called, and the memory of dubious Saints."

Martyr-Bishop Polycarp, and celebrate his glorious victory which happened in 167.

The Service used was the Eucharist, because therein is specially asserted the close spiritual fellowship between the living and the departed.

In the subject treating of "Prayers for the Faithful Departed" we have given examples of these commemorative-sacrificial Services.

But later on, owing to the higher powers attributed to the departed Saints, the idea spread that their intercessions for us could obtain pardon for our sins; against this, and consequent exaggerations, Tertullian thought it necessary to issue warning words: "Quis permittit homini dare quæ Deo reservanda sunt? Sufficiat martyri propria delicta purgasse" ("De pudicitiâ"). If we bear in mind that miracles were asserted to have been performed at the graves of such Saints, or by the touching of their bones, and that the power of the Saints as our patrons became more and more exaggerated, then we can understand that there arose also a feeling that their friendship must be cultivated, with the result that (the multitude at least) raised these Saints to the status—if we may say so without irreverence—of lesser deities.

The style of language used became more and more inflated, more and more impregnated with excitement, exceeding the bounds of even correct religious symbolism, even of poetic licence in the Commemorations of Martyrs and other Saints. Even the conservative Eastern mind enwrapped its thoughts in clouds of hyperbole and elegiac invocations which partook of the nature of addresses to the Saints, so that the populace, fickle, excitable, unrestrained, were led to believe that the spirits of those holy con-

querors were ever hovering near to dispense, of their own power, showers of blessings refreshing both to body and soul.

Moreover, certain writers employed exaggerated epithets of honour, interlarded with extravagant Oriental phraseology. Cyril of Alexandria (444), as also Proclus of Constantinople (447), speak of the Blessed Virgin as "The Paradise of the Second Adam."

Neither did much time elapse before even angels were improperly honoured. The Synod of Laodicea (about the middle of the fourth century) considered it necessary to prohibit such undue invocations of angels, and Theodoret (Bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, from A.D. 420 to 457), speaks concerning angel-worship and, with S. Augustine and Pope Gregory I., protested against such invocation and worshipping of these celestial ministers and messengers.

Heresies, and controversies connected therewith, assisted in producing exaggerated erroneous methods and principles of Saint-adoration. Dr. Newman wrote: "The treatment of the Arian and Monophysite errors (fourth and fifth centuries) became the natural introduction of the cultus sanctorum."

The Nestorian heresy—connected as it was with the sublime mystery of the Incarnation of our Lord, of the union of His Divine Nature with His Human Nature, "Perfect God and perfect Man . . . God and Man is One Christ," and necessarily inseparable from the Virginity of His holy Mother,—added interest to the subject of our Lord's Natures. Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 439), taught, among other errors, that in our Lord there were *two Persons* (instead of teaching that in Him were two Natures and *One Person*), and that the two Natures were joined together only as two men are in will and affection,

admitting only a junction (*συνάφεια*) of the one and the other, an indwelling of the Godhead (*ἐνοίκησις*). He rejected Θεοτόκος as title for the Blessed Virgin, suggesting instead Χριστοτόκος. He strongly protested, at the same time, against the accusation that he denied the Hypostatic Union of the two Natures. As it appeared that his doctrine denied the *Divinity* of Christ, his teaching was condemned at Ephesus, June, 431. Thus the glory of the God-Man reflected on His Mother.

To inculcate the Catholic truth the Church often mentioned the Blessed Virgin in the Services, both in East and West, using in Greek the words, "Maria Theotokos," in Latin, "Maria Mater Dei" (that is "The Mother of God"), and "Deipara."

We see the same desire displayed in the Theotokion which always concludes the Stichera in the Eastern Church. The Stichera are hymns sung in honour of her whom the Angel said was "Blessed"; the Theotokion is one of the *addresses* made to the Blessed Virgin, and used at the very end of the Communion Service, just before the dismissal of the congregation. These *addresses* or hymns in honour of the Ever-Virgin Θεοτόκος were first added to the Greek Office Books during the struggling times when these controversies on the doctrine of the Incarnation—to which we have already referred—were raging in the fifth century, in order to emphasize Catholic protests against both the Nestorian and Monophysite heresies. The Theotokion, taken from the Octoechos—a book with music in two volumes folio—is divided into eight voices or tones, each tone containing services for one week—what is here quoted shows us the form of hymn so constantly used: "Who shall not bless thee, all Holy Virgin? Who shall not sing thy peerless bearing? For the only-begotten Son, the

eternal effulgence of the Father Himself, came forth from thy chaste womb, made flesh ineffably; being God by nature, and becoming man by nature for our sakes; not being divided into two persons but being made known in two Natures unconfounded (*οὐκ εἰς δυάδα προσώπον τεμνόμενος ἀλλ' ἐν δυάδι φύσεων ἀσυγχύτως γνωριζόμενος*). Beseech Him, revered of all, blessed One, to have mercy on our souls."

"The theological importance of the title consists in this, that it is a condensed expression of the *personal Divinity* of the Redeemer. The modern license of using theological terms with their legitimate meaning scooped out has extended itself to the phrase, 'Divinity of Christ,' which is sometimes adopted as an imposing or reassuring synonym for 'moral supremacy,' or 'pre-eminent conformity to the Divine mind.' Undoubtedly 'Theotokos' will not fit in with any such recogniton of 'divinity.' It pre-supposes that the 'ego,' or 'self,' of Jesus Christ is identical with the 'ego,' or 'self,' of Him Who in the beginning was with God and was God, the Only-begotten Son Who was in the bosom of the Father, and 'by Whom all things were made'; that this Divine Person did actually assume our humanity by means of actual birth without any compromise of His essential pre-existing and inalienable Deity. This belief being accepted, it follows that she whose Son is Himself God, that is, of whom was born that Body Which from the moment of Its origination He appropriated; so that with It, and in It, He entered our earthly sphere of being, and became Man, this, and neither more nor less, is the purport of Theotokos" (Dr. Bright's "St. Leo on the Incarnation," quoted by the Rev. Vernon Staley in his "Exposition of Catholic Doctrine," pub. Mowbray and Co., 1895, 3/6).

The "Longer Catechism" of the Russian Church, Blackmore's Translation, pp. 62, 63, explains shortly and plainly the meaning of Theotokos:—

"*Q.* What other great title is there with which the Orthodox Church honours the Most Holy Virgin Mary?

"*A.* That of *Mother of God.*

"*Q.* Can you show the origin of this title in holy Scripture?

"*A.* It is taken from the following words of the Prophet Isaiah: *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and they shall call His name Immanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us* (Isa. vii. 14; S. Matt. i. 23).

"So also the righteous Elizabeth calls the Most Holy Virgin *The Mother of the Lord*, which title is all one with that of Mother of God. *Whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?* (S. Luke i. 43).

"*Q.* In what sense is the Most Holy Virgin called Mother of God?

"*A.* Although Jesus Christ was born of her not after His Godhead, Which is eternal, but after the manhood, still she is rightly called the Mother of God, because He that was born of her was both in the conception itself and in the birth from her as He ever is *very God.*

"*Q.* What thoughts should we have of the exalted dignity of the Most Holy Virgin Mary?

"*A.* As Mother of the Lord she excels in grace and nearness to God, and so also in dignity every created being, and therefore the Orthodox Church honours her far above the cherubim and seraphim."

But words intended for the supreme honouring of Christ alone, in order to emphasize His Divinity, were, little by little, communicated to the Mother also, and tended to

assign to her a position in her own individuality not originally intended.

Writers and preachers—especially those of a contemplative nature—carried with the torrent of the vulgar, "which is able to do so much in these matters," gave up mentioning Christ, inventing with one accord new phrases, new epithets, and religious functions, insomuch that about the year 1050 a Daily Office was instituted to the Blessed Virgin, distinguished by the Seven Canonical Hours, in a form which anciently was always used to the honour of the Divine Majesty, and in the next hundred years the worship so increased that it arrived at the pitch of even attributing that to her which the Scriptures speak of as belonging unto the Divine Wisdom.

During the Pelagian heresy (Pelagius c. 400) its author maintained that certain people had been *sinless*, *e.g.*, Abel, Enoch, Deborah, Hannah, and others, and the *Blessed Virgin above all* (for further exposition see Blunt's "Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, and Schools of Thought," under the Article "Pelagians"). This heresy was condemned at the Third General Council, held at Ephesus in 431. But the remarks about the Blessed Virgin gave an idea of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which was more plainly brought forward in 1140 at Lyons. But S. Bernard, of Clairvaux, opposed it. Later on the battle was waged between the *Franciscans*, who followed Duns Scotus, and the *Dominicans*, who preferred the scientific S. Thomas Aquinas. *En passant*, it may be remarked that this was not the only point on which the members of these two famous Orders were opposed to each other, for at the Council of Trent, in the important matter of Sacramental Grace, the Dominicans accused the Franciscans of being Lutherans!

Father Paul Sarpi treats of these distortions and exaggerations, showing how the erroneous dogma of the Immaculate Conception thereby started and gained force. He speaks of how the learned Dominican Order "did constantly resist this doctrine, and followed S. Thomas Aquinas, one of their order, famous for his learning." Pope John XX., in order to annoy the Franciscans—because, in general, they favoured the Emperor Ludwig, of Bavaria, whom the Pope had excommunicated—canonized Aquinas.

The Eutychian heresy—condemned at the Fourth General Council, held at Chalcedon in 451—asserted that our Lord did not possess *human nature*, annihilating apparently the Humanity of Christ. Inasmuch as this heresy touched upon the human nature of Him Who was "born of the Virgin Mary," "Of the Substance of His Mother," the Theotokos, Mother of God, was necessarily referred to very many times, and the Orthodox, in their laudable anxiety to uphold one of the elementary truths of the Christian Faith, sometimes exalted her unduly.

S. Irenæus was the first among the Fathers to set forth the Virgin Mary as the counterpart of Eve, as a "Mother of all living," in a spiritual sense, a title perfectly true, because she was the Mother of God in the flesh, Jesus the Christ, through Whom alone all live.

"A play upon the name Eve was perpetrated. For the salutation of 'Ave'—that is 'Hail'—became the counterpart of 'Eva' or Eve, and 'Quemadmodum illa (Eva) seducta est ut effugeret eum . . . sic hæc Maria suasa est obedire Deo uti Virginis Evæ Virgo Mariæ fieret *advocata*; et quemadmodum adstrictum est morti genus humanum per virginem, salvatur per virginem,' or—to put it more fully in English—'As Eve, through the discourse of an Angel,

was seduced so as to flee from God, having transgressed His word, so also Mary, through the discourse of an Angel, had the good news imparted to her,' so as to hear God and to be obedient to His word. And as Eve was seduced, so as to flee from God, so the other was persuaded to be obedient to God, that the Virgin Mary might become the *Advocate* of the Virgin Eve; and as the human race was bound to death by a virgin, so is it saved by a Virgin."

Archbishop Usher, of Armagh (d. 1656), comments thus on this very sentence of Irenæus: "When Irenæus calls the Virgin Mary the advocate of Eve he that considers his words here, and in III. 33, shall find that he saith it, not because she prayed for him, but because she believed the Angel's message, and submitted to God's will, and so became the means of saving all, though by our Lord Christ Who pleadeth for her as well as Eve . . ."

We do not quote much from the Early Fathers with respect to their ideas of Invocation of Saints, the passages would be many in number, and, moreover contradictory, as there does not exist a consensus of opinion among them—as seems to be the case also in the expressions of their views about "the Saints" going directly to Heaven after the moment of their deaths.

Dean Luckock, of Lichfield, in his work, "After Death" (pp. 196, 197), writes: "'Trustworthiness of the Patristic evidence for Invocation tested.' To summarize the result of the preceding observations and criticisms, it appears that Origen cannot be claimed in favour of Invocation, that S. Chrysostom's contradictions are such as to lessen the force of his evidence, that S. Gregory Nazianzen speaks doubtfully, that S. Ambrose, in the little which he has said upon the subject, is inconsistent with himself; but that the

testimony of SS. Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Ephraim, and Augustine remains so far unshaken."

The first formal Invocation is found, we believe, in the prayers of Ephraim Syrus (378), and in S. Gregory Nazianzen (389), where we read of Justinia beseeching the Blessed Virgin to protect her virginity. But we also read that S. Epiphanius—about A.D. 400 – condemned any such undue reverence to the Virgin Mary, in his writings against the Collyridian heretics who first gave the title "Queen of Heaven" to our Lord's Mother. He wrote: "*ἐν τιμῇ ἐστιν Μαρία, ὁ δὲ Πατήρ . . . προσκυνείσθω, τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνείτω.*"

We have already said that in the fourth and fifth centuries the practice increased, but it was not until the ninth that Invocations to the Blessed Virgin became more like to what they now are in the Roman Communion, and not formally recognized until the eleventh century.

The "Ave Maria" appears in the Liturgy of S. Mark, but its presence in that of S. James is an interpolation of later date. Even in the Roman Breviary the "Hail Mary," was not used as a *prayer* until about the time of Sully, Bishop of Paris, about A.D. 1200, when we find it mentioned in his diocesan Statutes. The words, used as an *Invocation*, are not, we understand, to be found before 1508. Dr. Rock states that the "Ave Maria" was not used in England as a Devotion before 1237, at least there is no reference made to it, which is strange if it were previously in use. But it appears as an *antiphon* in the Sacramentary of S. Gregory (A.D. 590).

Mr. Simmons, in his carefully edited book, "The Lay Folks' Masse-Book, etc., or Offices in English according to the Use of York" (1879), asserts that "the last form in which the 'Ave Maria' was put forth by authority in a

Service Book of the Church of England was this: 'Hayle Mary, full of Grace, our Lorde is with thee, blessed be thou among women, and blessed be the fruit of thy wombe, Jesus. Amen.'" This quotation is made from the "Primer in Latin and English, John Wayland, 1555." He comments thereon in this manner: "As now used in the Church of Rome, there is a further addition of a prayer to the Blessed Virgin ('Sancta Maria, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc et in hora mortis nostræ'), which was first authorized by Pope Pius V., by Bull, dated 7th July, 1568."

"In the 'Institutions of a Christian Man,' an authoritative statement of Anglican doctrine set forth by Church and State in 1537, there is an 'Exposition of the Ave Maria,' headed by it in the words: 'Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.'" At the end of the "Exposition," which is entirely occupied with setting forth the blessing of the Incarnation, is the following paragraph respecting the true devotional use of this formula: "We think it convenient that all Bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed to their spiritual charge, that this 'Ave Maria' is not properly a prayer as the Paternoster is. For a prayer properly hath words of petition, supplication, request, and suit, but this 'Ave Maria' hath no such. Nevertheless, the Church hath used to adjoin it to the end of the Paternoster as an hymn, laud, and praise, partly of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for our redemption, and partly of the Blessed Virgin, for her humble consent given and expressed to the angel at this salutation. Lauds, praises, and thanks be in this 'Ave Maria' principally given and yielded to our Lord as to the

author of our said redemption, but herewith also the Virgin lacketh not her lauds, praise, and thanks for her excellent and singular virtue, and chiefly for that she humbly consented, according to the saying of the holy matron, S. Elizabeth, when she said unto this Virgin, Blessed art thou that diddest give trust and credence to the Angel's words—for all things that have been spoken to thee shall be performed" (see Article, "Ave Maria," in Blunt's "Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology"). Excellently well does the wording of the "Exposition" strike us; no "Mariolatry" here, but the holy Mother given her due place after her Son, "blessed above all women," yea, above all human beings, as "the Mother of my Lord."

The wording of the Council of Trent in their Decree is: "It is good and useful to invoke the Saints in a suppliant (suppliciter) manner, and to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance, to obtain favours from God through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, Who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour."

The language strikes us as being of a studiously moderate tone, and thus far, *quâ* expression, may not be deemed at all reprehensible—leaving it an open matter—whether or no the Saints hear us, and if so do they hear us at all times.

Firstly, with respect to Angels. We think it was tough old Latimer (?) who wrote: "The Angels who have been given to us for our protection are to be invoked in our behalf." Invoking in this sense, its proper sense, means calling upon.

Likewise does Bishop Montague write: "It is a received opinion, though it be not of faith, that every person, at least every righteous person, has a Guardian Angel, who is always present with him by God's command and appoint-

ment, and, therefore, I think it in no way absurd in nature, nor in any respect contrary to the analogy of the Faith, or to Scripture, much less impious to say: 'Holy Guardian Angel, pray for me.'

"In these latter days it is to be feared that the ideas we had in childhood, believing every one has his or her Guardian Angel, have disappeared from the recollection of many, just as the glamour of fairy stories has lost its charm for us, and that the former are considered to be on the same platform as the latter. But the belief is accepted throughout the Universal Church, and it is difficult, impossible, to suppose that if we speak to these always by us they neither hear us, nor understand our wants; it cannot be wrong to thank them, through Christ, for their continuous care of us, to let them know we recognize their continual presence, both in our private lives and in the Altar Service of the Holy Mysteries, for they are ministering spirits sent forth to minister," etc. (Heb. i. 14). S. Ambrose, speaking of asking our Angels to defend us (the only Father of his time who does so, if we remember rightly), says: "Obsecrandi sunt angeli, qui nobis ad præsidium dati sunt, martyres obsecrandi" ("De Viduis," Chap. IX).

But in this instance, we may, perhaps, do more than merely ask the * Guardian Angel to pray for us. It seems not at all illogical to suppose that as the Angel sees the person he guards—which he must do in order to keep guard—therefore the Angel must certainly hear the request of

* We cannot forbear quoting the following words of Dr. Pusey: "The care of these little ones, one by one, is given to Angels who behold not the outskirts of God's glory only, nor are at times only illumined by it, but at all times behold the very Face of God, while ministering to them. Each of these unconscious little ones has such a Guardian assigned to it; and, from the great dignity of these their appointed Guardians, we are to learn their great value in our Father's eyes."

the mortal, and so we do not think that this prayer, quoted from Père Maurel's book—a work several times quoted by us—is in any way incorrect.

"Angel of God, who art my Guardian by the blessing of Divine love; enlighten me, protect me, direct me, govern me. Amen."

Here the Angel is only asked to do what it is his mission to do; the prayer may be unnecessary, but that is quite another matter. The idea of such Guardianship was taught in primitive times, and received everywhere by all. This cannot be truthfully asserted of the Romish error which teaches that the Blessed Virgin should be addressed directly, because, being the Fountain of Mercy, she grants favours more readily than the King of kings and Lord of lords.

The present Lord Bishop of Exeter writes thus upon the honour due to Saints and Angels, speaking of their special days, concerning the "observance of those days which are so closely interwoven with the Gospel story that they shed a holy light upon our Christian year. . . . Surely Saints' Days are most helpful in reminding us that God has knit together His elect in one communion and fellowship, and might be made occasions for lessons from God's past dealings with His Church, which would be beyond all price. We cannot afford to ignore our great library of Christian biographies, of which these form the earliest chapter. Or, as a day which stands by itself, let me single out the festival in which we are taught to commemorate S. Michael and All Angels. Is there no danger of a disastrous recoil from the Romish error of the worship of Angels, so that practically many Christians pass over that of which the Bible says so much—the wonderful order and services of those worshipping spirits sent forth to minister (λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν

ἀποστελλόμενα. — Heb. i. 14) to the heirs of salvation"? ("Charge by Edward Henry Bickersteth, D.D., Sixty-second Bishop of Exeter . . . 1891").

Dr. Moberly, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, born 1803, died 1885, speaks with much of reverence and beauty concerning our duty towards these our mighty spiritual guardians:—

"The path of God's true servant, whoever he be, is continually and ever surrounded by them: camping round him, driving away evil, and giving him all refreshment and comfort as he needs them. . . . Very much do those people lose, not of truth only, but of comfort and help, and high thought, to whom the whole of this Invisible World is as though it were not—who walk through this work-day world seeing nothing but what their eyes can see, immersed in the tangible interests that surround them, closing, as far as they may, their spiritual sense against the spiritual realities of God's great world. And very much shall we gain, brethren, if soberly and seriously, and following the safe guidance of the Word of God, we open our minds and thoughts to this mighty world of Beings that we cannot see. If in our bodies we belong to this visible and earthly world, much more in our spirits, which are much more truly *ourselves*, do we belong to that spiritual world. We wrong ourselves grievously when we forget or neglect them, or shudder at them."

Yes! If we must take care lest, as some have done, we "worship" them with undue "worship," not less must we be careful not to treat with neglect, and practically with contempt, these holy creatures, some of whom, at least, "stand in the Presence of God": let us avoid extremes.

"To ask the Saints to pray for us is not wrong—which act is technically known as 'Comprecation.' For ourselves, we have never done so, having doubts whether in Paradise

—or reigning in Heaven with Christ, as some maintain—they hear us; but for those who believe that these holy beings can lend the attentive ear to the expression of our wants, or who see our trials, for such it is not wrong, even should it be fruitless. If the prayers of a righteous man avail much on earth, we fail to understand why unavailing should be the prayers of those who are being made perfect, who enjoy privileges from which we in this life are debarred, both as to sight and hearing of celestial visions and angelic sounds. It is difficult to suppose that they fail to pray for us, or why their intercession with God for us should be wrong or useless. It may be open to doubt whether they hear us, we dare not make this an article of faith, but on the other hand they *may*, even if only sometimes under certain conditions. The writer has never felt the slightest desire to ask their prayers, or to invoke them even lawfully; still, to say that the prayers of the righteous departed *must* not be requested, would be, we maintain, most presumptuous. If they see us, if they hear our cries in trouble, they must—in a higher way than when they lived on earth—realize our needs. And there is much truth in the principle of Saints having 'merits'—not in the Romish sense of having a claim upon God on account of their superabundant holiness—because the prayers of each one are those of a righteous soul accepted by Christ, and justified, because each one is a member of the Communion of Saints, partaking of the communication which they have with one another, and with the Head. They doubtless intercede, that is, pray for us; but the truth of the intercession of Saints for us who still live, by no means involves the practice of 'Invocation of Saints.' To invoke these has never been the wont of any portion of Catholic

Christendom. . . . Nor do I believe that we in the Church of England have any authority sufficient to sanction *direct Invocation* to any Saint" (Canon Body). Of "*direct* Invocation" we speak later on.

Since the Reformation in England, and the Protestant innovations in Germany, Switzerland, etc., opinions in favour of *indirect* Invocation have been expressed by several; we give two or three quotations or references.

Martin Luther, writing to his friend George Spalatinus, speaks not unfavourably. Spalatinus was an historian, born (b. 1568, d. 1643) at Mauleon. He was a man of considerable merits and learning, as we may suppose from the fact that Pius V. charged him to arrange briefs, etc., and he wrote "Annals Ecclesiastical," etc. Luther writes thus: "It was not at any time my intention to assert that venerating the Saints is superstitious, nor the invoking of them even for things entirely confined to this life." "Along with the whole Church of Christ, I maintain and judge that the Saints are to be honoured and invoked by us." He proceeded to say that, of course, people were not to suppose that they could obtain their desires through the powers and imputed merits of the Saints, "but in Christ alone."

And Bishop Latimer is reported to have said: "I never denied that they might be worshipped, and be our mediators, though not by way of *redemption* (for so Christ alone is a whole Mediator, both for them and us) yet by way of '*intercession*.'"

And Bishop Morton, of Durham (1632-1659), could pray: "And grant unto us by the prayers of all Thy Saints that in all things we may be fortified by Thy protection." Of course he did not mean that the protection would be given by or come from the Saints, or that God owed them a debt,

but that, granting the prayers of those holy spirits, He would give protection by the merits of the Precious Blood.

Thorndyke maintains that asking the Blessed Virgin and other Saints to pray for us is not praying to them, and that asking them to pray for us, "Pray for us," "We pray thee hear us," directly addressed to them is not idolatry, but only acting as we would on earth, when in great trouble, we ask a person, whom we feel to be a devout follower of Jesus Christ, to pray for us.

The words of that well-known Puritan, Richard Baxter, must not be lightly passed over: "Will you be fellow-citizens with them, and live in communion with them, seriously remember them? How can you remember God Himself, and not remember them that are His courtiers, and nearer to Him than you are? . . . The very nature of the life of Faith requireth us to look much to the departed Saints. . . . If you love and think on none of the Saints but those that are within your sight, you live (so far) only as by sight . . . Many are tender of giving too much to the dead Saints, that yet give too much to the living, without scruple."

Of such a character, briefly expressed, is the nature of lawful indirect Invocation. But we add the sensible words expressed by the Professors of Divinity, sent over by the Protestant Princes of Germany, when they replied to Henry VIII., in the matter of the Commemoration of Saints, A.D. 1539: "Seen that it appeareth by the holy doctors that the Holy Days or Feasts of Saints have been accustomed to be observed; and as we see as yet some holy Canons of that matter, but it appeareth not that there is made in the same a mention of their *Invocation* . . . we affirm, for a certainty, that the Saints do continually in-

tercede for the Church; albeit the Christian men owe to be taught that they shall not convert the same hope to the Saints which they ought to have unto God" (Strype's "Ecclesiastical Memorials," Vol. I., Chap. XLV., p. 528. Clarendon Press, 1822).

The Lutheran Abbot of Lokeren stated that that body could well accept an Invocation of Saints, provided that the Roman Catholics would publicly state that such an expression as "Holy Mary, free me in the hour of death," meant "Holy Mary, *intercede for me* at the hour of death"; also the Abbot declared that if the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints of the Tridentine Council were not to be reckoned as of compulsory belief, but could be left optional, then the Lutheran body could go with Rome.

Had the Revisors of the Articles wished to do away with all ideas of a cleansing Intermediate State, or with all calling upon Saints to pray for us, they would not, we may assume, have limited their objections to that particular and exaggerated form understood by the term "Romish Doctrine" or errors. They permitted the really Catholic practice which is so in accordance with what follows the existence of "the Communion of Saints," but did not force it—and wisely, for those were difficult and dangerous times. When it is asserted that the Saints may be able to obtain benefits for us by their prayers, it does not necessarily mean they give us those benefits themselves by their own overwhelming power of their own merits, or that their prayers are accepted on account of their merits, but in that sense which one of the Homilies—that "On Fasting"—says: "Fasting obtaineth notable things at His Hand"—not that the *merits* of our fasting can claim anything from God. Surely, in like sense, the Saints, by their prayers, may obtain things for us.

Using the word "Heaven" to signify the blessed Intermediate State of Paradise—a common use—we may agree with Gaume in his work, "La Catechisme de Persevérance," Vol. IV.: "The Church beholds the Saints as simple intercessors who can ask blessings for mankind without bestowing anything; who remain in Heaven what they were on earth, creatures offering to their Creator thanks and prayers."

S. Victor writes thus on the Intercession of Saints:—

"It is asked whether the Saints, whose adovcacy we entreat, intercede for us and in what way? That the Saints intercede for us is nothing else but that God, for their merits, rewards the good affections which we have towards them for His sake, and therefore it is of no consequence whether they hear us or not. This one thing is certain, that the souls of the Saints (placed in the secret of the Divine contemplation) know only as much of these things which are going on without as contribute to their joy or our help. We seek intercession with God. What more dost thou wish? Fearest thou that perchance they should not pray who are always praying? But thou sayest, They do not hear. Yea, let us suppose that they do not hear. Does God not hear? He Who is to reward thy devotion sees thy humility. But if they hear not at all, what is hearing but knowing? For there is but one only light in which they both hear so as to perceive and see so as to know. I do not presume to judge further, but this only that they see so much as appears good to Him Whom they see and in Whom they see."

A real difficulty arises as to what is meant by "worship," "adoration." The latter word is derived from *ad* = to, and *orare* = to pray, or as some say, from *os*, *oris*, mouth; because placing the hand on one's mouth was an attitude or action commonly used when praying to the gods, or when a

subject saluted the Emperor. It has at least two meanings—(1) Act of homage, (2) Act of "worship," as generally understood.

Then there is the Greek προσκῠνέω = to prostrate oneself before anyone in token of respect, to do obeisance, of the gods = to worship (Liddell and Scott). Hence προσκύνησις (*cf.* Article on "Images") may mean—to bow in token of reverence — see Canon quoted later on with respect to saluting the Altar. Throughout the records of the Second Council of Nicæa, in the Latin translation the word "adorare" is put as equivalent to the Greek.

Schrevelius, in his Greek and English Lexicon, has προσκυνεῖν = "to kiss the hand, adore, worship, revere, pray, salute." And under "worship" he refers the reader to "venerable" and προσκύνησις = honourable reverence.

S. Gregory Nazianzen indeed uses for that one highest worship due to God alone several words — προσκυνεῖν, εἴδωλον σέβεται, λατρεία, σέβασμα, θεραπεύω, θύειν. Cardinal Bellarmine uses adoratio, cultus, veneratio, in one single passage (which we translate adoration, worship, veneration), as signifying the same quantity and quality of "worship." Also, when speaking of heathen worshipping idols, he uses the word "colere," the very word now used by Romanists when speaking of that worship which, so they say, should be rendered to sacred images.

"Worship" may mean only that honouring which is used in the Marriage Service when the man says, "With my body I thee worship," *i.e.*, hold his wife in all due honour. Or it may include that term significative of the honour in which the office of Magistrate or Mayor was regarded in former times, and we still address the holder of such an honour as "Your Worship." Certain Judges we address as "Your Honour."

Some of our readers may remember that in the collection of the well-known "Paston Letters" is one written by the Duke of Suffolk in 1450, temp. Henry VI. Addressing his son, aged eight, and having told the child to be true in heart to the King, he continues: "I charge you, my dear son, to *worship* your lady and mother."

We would also draw our readers' attention to a very modern instance in which the word "adoration" is employed to signify bowing to, or towards, the making of a curtsy or reverence. In "The Form and Order of Her Majesty's Coronation in the Abbey Church of S. Peter, Westminster, on Thursday, the 28th of June, 1838," this ritual direction occurs: "The Queen in the meantime passes up through the body of the Church, into, and through the Choir, and so up the stairs to the Theatre"—the raised platform between the Choir and the Sanctuary—"and having passed by her throne, she makes her humble *adoration*." No one will say that Her Majesty was to worship or adore, in the commonly accepted meaning, anything at that time in the Abbey. She was to obey the Seventh Canon of the Convocation of 1640, to make the "Reverence *versus* Altaire"—"We therefore think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they may be ready . . . by doing reverence and obeisance, both at their coming in and going out of the said Churches, or Chapels, according to the most ancient custom of the Primitive Church in the purest times. . . ."

One method of election to the Patriarchal Chair of Rome is by the act of "adoration" on the part of the electing Cardinals. To assert that the Cardinals "adore," in the sense *commonly* understood by this word in the English, would be absurd.

Eginhard, the biographer of Charles the Great, narrating the circumstances in connection with the crowning of Charles as Emperor by Pope Leo III. in 800, reports thus: "Pope Leo placed on his head a crown . . . the Pontiff prostrated himself before him" (Charles), "and gave him adoration, according to the custom established in the days of the old Emperors."

It must be remembered that besides the vulgar signification of the word "*adoration*," there exists also a technical meaning and application.

Bishop Ridley draws our attention to the difficulty connected with the word "adoration," when — speaking of worship in the Eucharist—he says: "There is a deceit in this word '*adoramus*.' We *worship* the symbols, when reverently we handle them. . . . If you mean the external Sacrament, I say that that also is to be *worshipped* as a Sacrament."

Mr. Ruskin also uses the word "worship," in the sense of respect of reverence, in his "Our Fathers have told us," Part IV.: "Be ye very solemnly assured of this; that neither Madonna-worship, nor Lady-worship of any sort, whether of dead bodies or of living ones, ever did any human creature any harm — but that money-worship, Wig-worship, Cocked-Hat-and-Feather-worship, Plate-worship," etc.

The Reverend John Henry Blunt, in his "Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology," writes thus on the word "worship": "This word is derived from the older English 'weoro-scips,' which is itself formed from 'worth,' the equivalent of 'honour.' It was used until recent times for honour paid to human persons as well as, or even more than, for honour paid to the Divine Persons. In the old

Manuals of the Church of England the words of betrothal were, 'wyth myne body ych the honoure,' but 'God that commandest to worschipe thi fadir and thi moder,' and 'if ony man serue me my fadir schul worschipe him,' are found in Wickliffe's Bible, at the end of the fourteenth century; while in the 'Liber Festivalis' every gentleman's house is called a 'place of worship,' as every gentleman was once addressed by his inferiors by the same title, 'your worship,'" which is still used for Justices of the Peace.

In more recent English a distinctive sense equivalent to λατρεία (latria) has been given to the word by means of the prefix "Divine," and it is frequently used without that prefix in the same sense in popular language. For want of attention, however, to the old usage, the "worship of the Saints," has often been confused with Divine Worship, and thus wrongly identified with Idolatry.

The act of kissing the Sovereign's hand as a sign of homage may be considered as an act of adoration, that is of loyal, loving respect of honour; "honour (τιμᾶτε) the King." For our part we would willingly kiss the hand of the worthily-venerated Leo XIII., because, although we do not consider him to be a King, and do not believe that any true and valid Roman Pope has existed since 1492, still we do regard him as the chief Patriarch of the Universal Church, "the first among his equals," of all Bishops. One may sometimes hear a French person, speaking of a friend, or of a little child, say, "Comme je l'*adore*."

S. Augustine uses very definite words, and employing the words we translate "worship," explains the sense in which he uses that word: "The Christian people unite in celebrating the memories of the Martyrs with religious solemnity, both to excite to an imitation of them, and to be

associated with their merits, and aided by their prayers; yet so, that to none of the Martyrs, though in places dedicated to Martyrs, do we dedicate Altars. . . . What is offered is offered to God, who crowned the Martyrs, in places dedicated to their memories whom He crowned; that from the admonition furnished by those very places, a greater affection may arise to make our love keener, both towards Him by Whose help we have that ability. . . . We therefore *worship* the Martyrs with that *worship* of love and of fellowship with which, *even in this life, holy men are worshipped*, whose hearts we feel are ready to endure a similar death for evangelical truth."

The words in italics are sufficiently explanatory, for no Christian ever worshipped—in the sense generally understood—a fellow living man who, however holy and walking daily with Christ, was yet felt to be a man of like passions.

Neither does this honouring of the holy departed of necessity accredit them with powers of omniscience—as to present mundane affairs, if the suggestion of the great Bossuet be true, whose name appears on the Roman Index Expurgatorius, by the bye. He says: "No Roman Catholic ever thought that the Saints, of *themselves*, know our wants, nor even the desires on account of which we direct our private prayers to them."*

The Gallican Bishop then proceeds to say that the Angels,

* "Jamais aucun Catholique n'a pensé que les Saints connussent par eux-mêmes nos besoins, ni même les désires par lesquels nous les prions" (Exposition IV.). But after all, the learned Bishop was "a mere Gallican"! It is certain that abroad the multitude believe that the Saints possess ubiquity, etc. It is certain that these people have no idea that the Virgin and S. Joseph require the angelic information, but are omnipresent, and omniconscious; indeed that one's prayers are more likely to be granted if offered to the Virgin than to our Lord.

who are our guardians, see us, and may inform the Saints of our wants.

This may be the *doctrine* of the Roman Communion, but what says Archbishop Bramhall? "A *comprecation*"—*i.e.*, praying *with* the Saints—"both the Grecians and we do allow; an *ultimate* invocation both the Grecians and we detest; so do the Church of Rome *in their doctrine*, but they vary from it in their *practice*."

But not only is there a difficulty as to the meaning of words, but a possible confusion, language having become "worse confounded" through the impracticable and various degrees in which the Roman Church has seen fit to divide and label "worship": partly because of the various words and of the signification attached to them in the older languages, and because writers differ as to their application.

It was in the Second Council of Nicæa (787)—in the matter of reverencing, etc., images—that a distinction was drawn between λατρεία and τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις; the first used with respect to that supreme worship due to God only, while the second and third words were for that inferior veneration due to images. But even in the Greek there was confusion, for we read: "Thou shalt worship (προσκύνησεις) the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve (λατρεύσεις)."

Peter Lombard (A.D. 1100-1160), while affirming that latria was due to God alone, yet ventured to assert that there was even a higher and lower quality of inferior worship, two degrees of douleia, one belonging to every creature, the other to the *Human Nature of Christ!* A very dangerous addition to ideas, and suggestive of a modern type of criticism as to our Lord's Human Nature.

As to the term ὑπερδουλεια (hyperdoulia), Möeller says: "The expression of hyperdoulia is first found in Petrus

Lombardus for the worship which is due to the Human Nature of Christ—which is connected with his inclination towards the Adoptionist separation of the two Natures in Christ—while, following the traces of more correct ecclesiastical Christology, it was necessary to avoid this, and to allow the adoration of the Humanity of Christ to coincide with that of the Eternal Word" (Möeller's "History of the Christian Church . . . The Middle Ages").

Some say S. Thomas Aquinas added another quality of worship, that of *ὑπερδουλεία*, a superior *δουλεία* due to the Blessed Virgin, and to her alone.* The thing now lies confessed, and we may, or may not, be surprised to hear that in this year (1895) another intensity of worship is to be used with respect to S. Joseph, viz., *protodouleia*.

A correspondent encloses the following quotation of a prayer to S. Joseph, taken from a copy of "The Church Times," in the year 1880-81:—

"Modern Romanism.—A correspondent sends us the following translation from 'Meditations a l'usage du Clergé et des Fidèles,' by M. Hamon, curé de Saint Sulpice:

* One might almost be thankful that S. Thomas gave no higher degree of worship to the Blessed Virgin Mary than hyperdoulia. But others have not failed to explain S. Thomas's words, as did Cabrera, who wrote: "Cajetan understands this to be the opinion of S. Thomas, not absolutely and simply, but by reason of scandal or danger; in the absence of which he admits that the Blessed Virgin may be worshipped with the adoration of latria in respect to her *contact* alone. Other theologians are of opinion that she may be adored with latria, not merely on account of contact, but also on account of her maternity and consanguinity." "Hanc D. Thomæ sententiam intelligit Cajetanus hic non absolute et simpliciter, sed ratione scandali aut periculi, quo cessante concedit posse B. Virginem coli adoratione latriæ ratione solius contactus. Alii theologi opinantur non solum ratione contactus, verum etiam ratione maternitatis propter sanguinis conjunctionem posse adorari latria." According to the writer, S. Thomas really meant that the Virgin ought to be worshipped with latria, but, afraid that people might be shocked or scandalized, he diluted his sentiments in public.

'O Joseph, at once father of Jesus and husband of Mary, how great you are! What a grand place you must occupy in Heaven! From this earth I contemplate you with love, raised upon a throne very far above (qui depasse de bien loin) the twelve thrones on which the Apostles will judge the twelve tribes of Israel. For the Apostles are only the *servants* of Jesus Christ, and you He calls His *Father*. . . . Methinks I see you sitting even by the side of the Queen of Heaven, since you are her husband. . . . The power of Joseph far surpasses that of all the Angels and all Saints combined. What can the Incarnate Word refuse to him from whom He has received everything on earth, who has worked and lived for Him, etc.? What can He refuse to him whom He so loved on earth as to obey his slightest wishes as well as his express commands? Has He in Heaven changed His sentiments towards His adopted father? That cannot be supposed, and even if Joseph *alone* could not get his request granted, *has he not over the heart of Mary the most absolute claim (or power), the power of lawful authority? O how Mary would throw herself at the feet of Jesus rather than see her holy husband refused.* Now, if Mary and Joseph are for us, who shall be against us? We may say of Joseph what the Father said of Mary' (?), 'that her prayer is omnipotent to obtain what she asks.'"

S. Joseph, unrelated to our Lord, born after the manner of men, his power also is "*omnipotent*"!

The word δουλεία (dulia) means service. Now we are not the servants of the departed, however exalted above us they may be. In "Russia and the English Church," edited by Mr. W. J. Birkbeck (pub. Rivington, Percival and Co., 1895, 7/6), are remarks on the word "service," worthy of our attention. In Mr. Khomiakoff's second letter (1845),

we find these words: "You say that 'even those Anglican Bishops who are least inclined to favour the spiritual movement called Puseyism, do not fail nevertheless to acknowledge that their Church has never in any way condemned apostrophes and poetical addresses to Saints and Angels, but that the real objection of intelligent and well-disposed Anglicans is against prayers in prose seriously addressed to spirits and souls not present in the body as a *service* of homage and devotion.' I think the word *service*, though certainly often used in the acceptation you give to it, throws some confusion on the question. The song of triumph which meets the victorious warrior on his return to his native land has never been called a service, though it is assuredly joyful homage and an expression of gratitude and devotion. In the like manner, the homage paid by Christians to the noble warriors who have fought the spiritual battle of the Lord through ages and ages, and have held aright the tradition of the Church, should not perhaps be called a *service*, but an expression of joy and humble love. We cannot properly be said to serve our fellow-servants, though their station be infinitely exalted above our own. The objection of Anglicans and other Protestants has truth in it if directed against the word, none if against the thing itself. No enlightened member of the Orthodox Church could indeed understand it unless he were acquainted with the Roman definitions and theories which have in fact given birth to almost all the errors of Protestantism. But another objection remains. We address to created spirits not only the homage of our praises, but very earnest *requests* (as this expression would in this case perhaps be more correct than the expression '*prayers*'), asking for their intercession and prayers before the Majesty of our Saviour.

"'Where is the use of such requests? Where is our right to them? Do we want any other advocate but Christ our Lord? There can be no serious meaning in our addresses to created beings, and we may as well reject all those useless and idle forms.' There is the question. I will answer it with another. Was the Apostle serious when he asked for the prayers of the Church? Are the Protestants serious when they request their brethren (as they often do) to pray for them? Where is, if you please, the logic of the distinction? A doubt about the possibility or reality of a communication between living and dead through Christ and in Christ is too un-Christian to want an answer? To ascribe to the prayers of living Christians a power of intercession which is refused to the Christians admitted into heavenly glory would be a glaring absurdity. If Protestantism were true to logic, as it pretends to be, I may boldly affirm, that not only Anglicans, but all Protestant sects (even the worst) would either admit serious and earnest addresses to Saints and Angels, or reject the mutual prayers of Christians on earth. Why, then, are they rejected, nay, often condemned? Simply because Protestantism is for ever and ever protesting. Because the semi-pelagianism of Popery and its doctrine about merits and, as it were, self-worthiness of the Saints is ever present to Protestantism. Because Protestantism is not, nor ever can be, free. In short, because with its unceasing cry, 'No Popery,' it stands on Popish ground and lives on Popish definitions, and is as much a slave to the doctrine of utilitarianism (which is the ground-work of Popery) as the most fanatical Ultramontanist. Now we are free, and, though well aware that we want no intercessor but Christ, we give vent to our feelings of love and to our earnest longings for mutual prayer and

spiritual communion not only with the living, but with the dead, who have not been saved by their own worthiness (for none, even of the best, worthy, save Christ alone), but by the grace and mercy of the Lord, which, we hope, will be extended to us likewise. I readily concur with you in the opinion that if Anglicans would only practically admit and appreciate the beautiful poetry of hymns addressed to Saints and Angels, there would be no fear of any great difficulty remaining afterwards on this point in the way of peace; nor would I have spoken on the matter if I had not considered it as an example and a proof of the constant subjection of all the Western communities to the doctrines and spirit of Romanism."

Mr. Birkbeck places a footnote on page 31, concerning the word "service" ("Servitium beatæ Mariæ," etc.), used in connection with the worship of the Saints. "The Eastern Church does not employ the Western terms *doulia* or *hyperdulia*, but retains the more ancient terminology of the Seventh Œcumenical Council, describing the relative and secondary worship which the Church offers to the Saints, the holy images, the book of the Gospels, etc., by the term '*τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις*' as contrasted with *λατρεία*, or the absolute and primary worship which is due to God alone."

In Mr. Khomiakoff's Essay on the Church, we find some statements and definitions from the Eastern view concerning Purgatory, Prayers for the Departed, and Invocations of Saints.

Also in "The Longer Catechism" statements with authority concerning these points.

"*Q.* What means of communion has the Church on earth with the Church in Heaven?

"*A.* The prayer of faith and love. The faithful who

belong to the Church militant on earth in offering their prayers to God call at the same time to their aid the Saints who belong to the Church in Heaven, and these standing on the highest steps of approach to God by their prayers and intercessions purify, strengthen, and offer before God, the prayers of the faithful living upon earth, and by the will of God work graciously and beneficently upon them, either by invisible virtue, or by distinct apparitions, and in divers other ways.

"*Q.* On what is grounded the rule of the Church upon earth *to invoke in prayer the Saints* of the Church in Heaven?

"*A.* On a holy tradition, the principle of which is to be seen also in Holy Scripture. For instance, when the prophet David cries out in prayer, *O Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, our fathers*, he makes mention of Saints in aid of his prayer exactly as now the Orthodox Church calls upon *Christ our true God by the prayers of His most pure Mother and all His Saints* (see 1 Chron. xxix. 18).

"Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386, author of a well-known Catechesis), in his explanation of the Divine Liturgy, says: *We make mention also of those who are before departed, first of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, that by their entreaties and intercession God may receive our prayers* ('Cat. Myst.,' V., c. 9).

"Basil the Great (of Cæsarea, d. 378), in his sermon on the day of the Forty Holy Martyrs, says: *Whoever is afflicted has recourse to the Forty, and whoever is joyful runs to the same, the one that he may find release from his sorrows, the other that he may keep his happiness. Here the pious wife is to be seen praying for her children, another asks the return of her absent husband, another the restoration of health to the sick. Yes. Let our petitions be with the Martyrs.*

"*Q.* Is there any testimony of Holy Scripture to the *mediatory prayer* of the Saints in Heaven?

"*A.* The Evangelist John in the Revelation saw in Heaven an angel, to whom *was given much incense, that he should offer it by the prayers of all Saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne, and the smoke of the incense ascended up by the prayers of the Saints out of the hands of the angel before God* (Rev. viii. 3, 4)."

Mohler, in his well-known work "Symbolism or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants," Chap. VI., "The Church in the next world and its connection with the Church Militant; doctrine of Catholics on this matter," speaks of the Invocation of Saints in a way against which no educated Anglican can properly protest. His language is refined, his statements calm. He says: "The faithful, who, summoned away from hence, have quitted their visible communion with us, and have passed into another state of existence, do not (so the Catholic Church teaches us) thereby sever the bonds of connection with us. On the contrary, holy love, which was transferred from a higher order of existence to this lower world, perpetually enfolds in her sacred bands all those whom she has once held in her embraces (provided only they have not wilfully torn themselves from her), and amid the dissolution of all earthly energies still retains her eternal power."

In speaking of "the Triumphant Church," he refers to what he calls "Invocation" and "Intercession" of Saints. "Not only do they" (the Saints) "work among us by the sacred energies, which during their earthly pilgrimage they displayed, and whereby they extended God's Kingdom, and founded it more deeply in the hearts of men; energies, whose

influence acting at first on those within their immediate sphere, spread thence ever more and more widely, and will extend to all future times. Not only are they permanent models of Christian life, in whom the Saviour had stamped His Own Image, in whom He, in a thousand ways, reflects Himself, and in whom, exhibiting to us patterns for all the relations of life, He brings vividly before our view the whole compass of virtues rendered possible through Him. But they also minister for us (such is our firm and confident belief) in a still more exalted degree; and this their ministration requires for us a corresponding conduct. The purer their love, and the fuller their share in that ineffable bliss, whereof they have become partakers in Christ, the more they turn their affection towards us, and amid all our efforts and struggles remain by no means passive spectators.* They supplicate God on behalf of their brethren; and we in turn, conscious that the prayer of the righteous man availeth much with God, implore their intercession. The act whereby we do this is called *Invocation* (Invocatio); and that, wherein they respond to this call, is called *Intercession* (Intercessio). . . . Moreover, if we are to worship Christ, we are forced to venerate His Saints. . . . Lastly, it is to be borne in mind, that the doctrine of the Church does not declare that the Saints *must*, but only that they *may*, be invoked; since the Council of Trent . . . says, 'Only that it is *useful and salutary* to invoke with confidence the *Intercession* of the Saints.'"

Such a doctrine—not even a dogma *de fide*—as this, the Twenty-second Article does not protest against; possibly nothing more than this is necessary according to the wording of the Tridentine Council. But there are thousands of

*See quotation from Canon Wilberforce's sermon on pages 49-53.

cases in which "Intercession," "Invocation" of Saints, are taught in an exaggerated form, and people impressed with the duty of praying to the Blessed Virgin that she shall grant favours, that she—not *may* but—*must* be invoked, that she will often grant what our Blessed Lord will refuse, and that anyone who does not pray to the Virgin is "not a Christian"—of which more hereafter.

The Twenty-second Article of Religion contains a not unnecessary warning against the "Romish" system popularly received.

Perhaps the first author having passages about the Intercession of Saints is S. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386): "We commemorate . . . Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs . . . that God would receive our supplications because of their prayers and intercessions."

Also, we think S. Augustine of Hippo (354-430), was the first to assert that "at the Table of our Lord we do not commemorate Martyrs in the same way that we do others who rest in peace so as to pray for them, but rather that they may pray for us that we may follow in their footsteps" (see his "Harmonies of the Gospels").

Perhaps the first formal Invocations are found mentioned in the prayer of Ephraim Syrus (378), and in Gregory Nazianzen (389), it being in the latter that we read of Justinia beseeching the Blessed Virgin to protect her virginity.

But it is to absurd legends—or "*stories*" in the worst sense—of Saints and their alleged miracles, that unlawful, direct prayers became the fashion. Many such legends must be put down to "the preference of a credulous age for miraculous stories, and the tendency of the uneducated to delight in descriptions of cruel martyrdoms, among which

was so much of the poesy of chivalric woman-worship." Dr. Von Döllinger—in his lecture on "The Influence of Greek Literature and Culture upon the Western World in the Middle Ages"—says that the first to make a collection of the fantastic legends of Saints and Martyrs was the Byzantine statesman, Simeon Metaphrastes, that monks of Southern Italy translated many of these, among which legends was now and then a grain of truth. These often formed the bases of sermons, and the legends became in time accepted as facts. "It is obvious"—says Dr. Von Döllinger—"that this could only happen in an age when the mass of the clergy and the laity moved in a thick atmosphere of *illusion* and *deceit;* lacking entirely the faculty of distinguishing the historically possible and conceivable from simple impossibilities."

Of this character are the greatest number of "revelations" so-called.

The same reverend and most learned author — in his lecture "Upon the Political and Intellectual Development of Spain"—speaks of the wildest fables about the Patron Saint of that country, S. Jago (Santiago), or S. James, how that, although contrary to Holy Scripture and to profane history, he went to Spain, a legend believed in as far back as the tenth century. He appeared in thirty-eight battles, and was seen upon his white charger fighting against the Moslems. His corpse was wafted from Palestine round the whole coast of Spain, eventually finding a resting place, where was erected the famous shrine of Compostella ("Corpus Apostolici" or "Jacobus Apostolus"), the Cathedral of which city thus became the nominal successor of the favourite, and most dignified relic in all Spain. Also we are told how that the historian of the Spanish Church—

Vicente de la Fuente—speaking of the eleventh century, says, "We float in a sea of fables." Through such "a sea of fables," which has spread its waves not over Spain only but over all mediæval Europe, have accounts come to us of miracles performed by Saints, by the touching of their relics, to which are superadded innumerable forgeries, the whole garnished by the most flagrant interpolations.

The Reverend Joseph Berrington (Roman Catholic clergyman, 1743-1820), writes: "When we turn to the more copious stores of ecclesiastical learning we find little to repay the labour of perusal. A turgid eloquence, etc. . . . They received, with the most indiscriminate indifference, the most vulgar reports concerning the events of ancient times, and of those composed the *Lives* of several Saints, compilations which, with truth, have been defined to be 'a heap of insipid and ridiculous fables, void often of the least air of probability, and without the smallest tincture of eloquence.' I chiefly allude to a work of John Moschus, entitled, the '*Meadow* or *New Paradise*,' written in a low and barbarous style. He was himself a monk, who, early in this century (seventh), having visited the cells of the Cœnobites in Syria and Egypt, and even travelled into the West, undertook to relate the wonderful lives of the recluses whom he had seen, or of whose singular austerities and modes of life he had been informed. Not satisfied with the simple truth of many extraordinary facts, Moschus intermixed much matter which we must necessarily deem fabulous, but which found readers in that and a subsequent period, as ignorance spread her veil of darkness, and the *Meadow* itself soon proved a fertile repository from which the *Latins* drew many stores with the utmost avidity" ("Literary History of the Middle Ages").

And who shall be able to limit the extent of the mischief thus caused, and its influence upon the masses of Southern Europe in the present day!

Mr. Berrington shows how it was the policy of the heads of the Roman Church to permit ignorance to increase, in other words to cultivate superstition. He says that dislike of imparting or acquiring knowledge was owing "to a want of capacity in the bishops, clergy, and monks, upon whom the weighty charge of education had devolved—to a *selfish* reflection in the same order of men, that in proportion to the decline of learning and the *spread of ignorance*, their *Churches* and *Monasteries had prospered;* whilst the *revival of letters was likely to divert the copious streams of pious benevolence into a channel less favourable to the interests of the clergy and the monks. To a marked aversion in the Bishop of Rome to any scheme by which the minds of churchmen, or of others, might be turned to the study of antiquity, and to those documents which would disclose on what futile reasons and sandy foundations the exclusive prerogatives of his See were established.*" Mr. Berrington uses these very plain statements when he is giving reasons to show why the attempted Reformation of Charles the Great came to nought. "The clergy continued to be oppressed by the same supine indifference; the same intellectual drowsiness was seen in the monks, *while the people adhered with the same fondness, or clung with the same obstinacy, to their habits of credulity and superstition.*"

It may be noted that the fear of advance in learning was well founded. When the great "Revival of Letters" did burst forth, the infamous "Forged Decretals" were fully exposed, the * Centuries of Magdeburg blew them to atoms,

*We give a note on the "Centurions" or "Centuries" of Magdeburg. About 1550, Flacius Illyricus, when at Magdeburg, organized a society for

and a well tabulated succession of Popes shown to be convenient but fallacious, inventive but fraudulent.

Well might the Greeks at the Council of Toledo complain of forged documents, only too numerous.

Among the ignorant masses of Southern Europe there is even now the same clinging to credulity and superstition, false Saints, false "miracles"; false relics, are still the consoling delight of the vulgar, save where atheism spreads itself as a vast sore more hateful even than superstition, for the believing in too much is nevertheless "religion," even though it be degraded.

In such a fruitful ground of "traditions" no wonder the false far outweighs the true, and authority finds itself absolutely unable to erect gates against the flood of inventions intended to "incite to devotion," either to "the Sacred Heart" of our Lord, or to the unlawful cultus of the Blessed Virgin; we behold indeed "a sea of fables."

But this sea still receives into its vastness streams suitable to its peculiarities. In "The Garland of Mary"—by A. Constant—a book of devotions for the "Month of Mary," we find on page 5, "The men who pretend to wisdom will not believe these things"; that God grieves over such incomprehensible infidelity; and the Angels cried, "There is no longer any faith on the earth." Then God shrouded Himself in darkness; "but in that night Mary still shone as the moon does when the sun is set. A great cry rose up in Heaven, God withdrew His Hand, the earth sank, then

the purpose of writing certain histories. The divisions of this history were given by *Centuries;* hence the title by which this work is commonly known, which did not proceed further than with giving an account of the thirteenth century. The first volume appeared in 1560; the last (thirteenth century) in 1574.

Mary rushed *from her seat, stretched out her arm, and saved the world a second time.*"

Can an English pervert from his National Church to Romanism really believe this? That this event actually happened is stated as a fact; unless we err, it is either true or false; but perhaps it is only a "pious opinion." What is this? Is it a miracle-play on a platform in the Middle Ages? The Italian peasant would take it to be an account of a celestial all-but tragedy that had really taken place.

The mercy of the Blessed Virgin exceeds the loving mercy of God! The idea of presenting our Blessed Lord as the embodiment of Justice, but denying Him the gift of mercy—except in an inferior degree to that which S. Mary exercises—must shock many.

Regard the popular story of the vision wherein were seen many people endeavouring to ascend to Heaven by a red ladder, ever falling back again, but were enabled so to ascend by a white ladder. At the top of the red ladder was our Blessed Lord, at the top of the white was the Virgin Mother. The teaching is obvious, that looking unto Christ and the having faith in Him may prove to be useless, but that the worship done to the Virgin causes salvation to the worshipper, the Blessed Virgin is more merciful, it is a surer way which she points out!

Romanenses frequently assert that when their licensed teachers assert that none can come to Christ except through the Virgin, it is only meant that we must have faith in the Article of Faith that Christ was born of a pure Virgin, conceived by the Holy Ghost.

But such an assertion does not hold good here. Here are believers in our Lord as God, they behold Him at the top of the red ladder, they long to be with Him, they expect to

reach Him by His red ladder, but their attempts are useless, the white ladder is the surer way.

Alphonso Liguori (1696-1787) shows the direction of the wind, in his commentary on the sixteenth verse of the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews—Douai version. In the Scriptures we have: "Having therefore a great High Priest that hath passed into the Heaven, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not an High Priest Who cannot have compassion on our infirmities, but One tempted in all things like as we are, without sin."

The fashionable Saint and Romanensian commentator offers these remarks: "Mary, says S. Antoninus, is that Throne of Grace to which the Apostle S. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, exhorts us to fly with confidence, that we may obtain the Divine mercy, and all the help that we need for our salvation."

Both Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Manning gave their formal sanction to this work. Moreover, if what Bellarmine asserted be true, viz., that the Bishop of Rome is infallible in the canonization of Saints, the greatest reliance must be placed on the statements and principles of Liguori, and an excellent exponent of Papal sentiments. We do not venture to state that all the expressions of a Romish Papally-canonized Saint are infallible, having been informed by a Jesuit acquaintance that this is not so.

We are actually told, "We often *obtain more promptly* what we ask by calling on the name of Mary than by invoking that of Jesus." We do not believe that such a principle is in accordance with the spirit of the Council of Trent. What else can this be but a teaching that it is safer, surer, to pray directly to the Blessed Virgin than by addressing our prayers to Him Who is the Mediator, God-Man, between God and

man, our Lord, the Word Which "was God"? We are to be taught, if you please, that often we may be disappointed if we address ourselves directly to Him Who reigns in Heaven, "the Lamb," but the Virgin is more ready both to hear and to grant. It cannot be meant that these things which Christ refuses to grant us are evil, unsuitable to us, otherwise the Blessed Virgin would not bestow them, therefore they must be holy and profitable, therefore God the Son (into Whose Hands all things are given by the Father) refuses to give to His faithful suppliants what are holy gifts profitable to them.

These are words of prayer to the Blessed Virgin—

> "Tui sumus en! clientes;
> Tu sis mater, et gementes
> Duc ad cœli gaudium."

Here we have a prayer addressed to the Virgin that *she* would lead us to the joys of Heaven.

Yet, with such statements and similar prayers to confront him, with characteristic dishonesty and undiminished effrontery, Bruno in his "Catholic Belief" (!) closes his chapter on "Honour and Devotion to the Blessed Virgin" (Fifth Ed., p. 200) with asserting, or implying, that such honour and devotion consist only "in asking the Blessed Virgin Mary to pray to Jesus for us." If the honour and devotion to the Blessed Theotokos went no further than asking her to pray to God for us, then we need not have such discussion.

The Romanensians say: "You were afraid to approach the Father, you were terrified by merely hearing of Him. He gave Jesus Christ to you for a Mediator, but perhaps even in Him you dreaded Divine Majesty. You long to have an advocate with Him even, betake yourself to Mary"

(*cf.* Gabriel Biel, "Lectures on the Canon of the Mass," No. 32).*

But it may be urged that such expressions, such words, must not be taken *au pied de la lettre :* for the wording, allowance should be made that such sentences and superlative words are mere exaggerations produced by pious fervour. If we are to believe a Roman organ, "The Rambler," for November, 1854, such excuses should not be made: "We entirely accept S. Alphonso (Liguori) as a fair type of the *prevalent and living* spirit of Catholic devotion towards the Blessed Virgin . . . we deny that they are disliked by the rich, or the educated, or the laity, as such. We disclaim the theory that there is something un-English in their character : Liguori himself protested."

To quote Liguori again : "If it be true, as I hold for certain, that all graces are dispensed through the hands of Mary, and that all those who are saved are saved only by means of the Divine Mother, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the *salvation of all depends on preaching devotion to Mary, and having confidence in her intercession.*" †

* May not such a placing of the Virgin between Christ and men be in fact an actual despising of the Sacrifice in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar? There is no Divine Majesty visible in that greatest of all Services, for there the Majesty of Christ really present is veiled. Dare we suppose that we can offer any service as pure and as omnipotent as This before the Eternal Father?

† Alphonso Liguori, Bishop of Sant' Agata dei Goti, near Capua, in 1762. Pius VII. beatified him in 1816, and Gregory XVI. canonized him in 1839. ‡ In 1869 his work, "Salve Regina, ossia omaggio i divozione a Maria S.S.," was published at Milan. "Le Glorie di Maria" was brought out in 1784, at Bassano in 1819, Milan 1826 : "All favours are dispensed by Mary only . . . angels, men, and everything under the empire of God, should be equally under the domination of the Virgin." These are the words of him whom Pius IX. elevated to the rank of Doctor of the Church, *i.e.*, one of the great divines and teachers whose teaching is to be considered as of the highest authority.

‡ "The canonization of Saints was for many centuries of an informal and popular character, consisting merely of the recitation at Mass of the names of

Should a Roman Churchman argue that the words in italics in the preceding sentence mean only that grace and truth come but through our Blessed Lord and by means of His Incarnation, born of the Virgin Mary, and that in this sense only the Blessed Virgin is the door through which our Saviour came into the world as Man, then follows the further direct assertion that devotion must be paid to her. But the Roman, as others have done, may affirm that such devotion means merely that her prayers are to be desired, and her intercession is very valuable,—then follows the statement (strange to us) that *salvation cannot be obtained except through her intercession*, sought for and exercised. It is true that no such doctrine appears in inspired Apostolic writings, but those who uphold such "worship" do not hesitate to invent and to argue from a negative, for, in Loyala's remarks on our Lord's post-Resurrection appearance, the statement is made that He first appeared to the Blessed Virgin, and *that*, although no account of such a first appearance is found in Holy Scripture, still it was doubtlessly the fact, and that we must not doubt that the risen Lord *did* thus appear to His Mother before He did to anyone else, unless indeed we would wish to make to ourselves as applicable the words, "Are ye also without understanding?"

A certain Roman writer in his "Saturday dedicated to

such as were regarded as holy. As a more formal process, the earliest instance known is in 993, when Pope John XV. issued a Bull in honour of Udalric, Bishop of Augsburg (973), wherein the word 'canonization' first appears. But even still, the Metropolitans of every province retained the power of directing names to be inserted in the diptychs at Mass, till Alexander III., in 1172, took it away from them, and confined the power of canonization to the Popes. There have been, however, a few instances of popular canonization since, apart from Papal authority, the most notable of which, perhaps, is that of S. Jane de Valois, daughter of Louis XI., and divorced wife of Louis XII. The most curious English example is that of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, beheaded in 1326" (From "The Church Times").

Mary," affirms—though whether as a matter of veracious history or merely as contemporary legends, or as archæological discoveries to be made hereafter, we know not—that even during the lifetime of the Virgin, "the holy Apostles inculcated the worship of Mary by dedicating temples to her, as was done by S. James of Saragossa, by S. John in Asia, and also by S. Peter in Rome, not to mention many others, who, even in her lifetime, raised temples and altars to her."

This reminds us of what Cardinal de Bonald, Archbishop of Lyons, said in an address delivered by him in 1842: "The Saviour gave to religion, from the time of His cradle (des le berceau), a companion whose gentleness was to temper its severity. . . . This faithful companion was devotion to the Blessed Virgin. . . . Religion and this devotion together descended the holy mountain in order to work together for the salvation of souls. Thenceforth, wherever the standard of salvation was planted, were seen waving in the breeze the standards of Mary." If this were so, and there were "standards of Mary" at Colossæ, Rome, Corinth, in Thessalonica, Ephesus, Antioch, etc., it is remarkable that in the Epistle of S. Paul, "the Apostle of the Gentiles," no reference is made to such "standards." The assertion beats anything in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," and may remind us of Cobbett's "Reformation," with its lying picture, or the ridiculous Mediæval Myth of "Pope Joan."

We need not, considering all this, be surprised when Liguori quotes with satisfaction the words of Cardinal Bona, "I fall down before thee, most gracious Virgin, and worship in thee thy Son." We think it more primitive to worship Christ in Himself.

But the phraseology of prayers to the Virgin is about on a par with the sentiments expressed by Romish writers.

In the name of truth and the English language, what are the following lines but a *direct* prayer to the Virgin? except the last three words of the fourth line, which may be accepted:—

> "Soul of the Virgin, illuminate me,
> Body of the Virgin, guard me,
> Milk of the Virgin, feed me.
> O Mary, Mother of Grace, intercede for me;
> For thy servant take me;
> Make me always to trust in thee;
> From all evils protect me;
> In the hour of death assist me
> And prepare me a safe way to thee,
> That with all the elect I may glorify thee
> For ever and ever."

Or again, we can read, "I reverence you, O sacred Virgin Mary! and, *together with* the Holy Trinity, bless and praise you infinitely." However these words may be explained it is hard to see how, if S. Mary is to be praised *infinitely*, that God Himself can be praised more—if by "infinitely" be meant without bounds of limitation as to quality.

From which it would appear also that no Christian can worship God to the full unless he also worship S. Mary the Virgin, praise her "infinitely," that is to say *without any limitation* whatever. This form of words is taken from "The Devotion and Office of the Sacred Heart," p. 252, published by Duffy, Dublin, 1855.

We have seen also such statements as these: "The Blessed Virgin *merited* by congruity the salvation of the whole world." "Christ obtained nothing by His merits

which the Virgin Mother of God did not also gain out of congruity."

In a Romish Devotional work, "Novenas of the Blessed Virgin Mary," we can read: "O most holy Mary, I well understand how thy obedience to the Divine Will so intimately united thee to God that such a wonderful thing is not possible with any other creature, except, as blessed Albert expressed it, the *creature became God*."

The same work speaks of the Blessed Virgin Mary as "the *universal dispenser of all graces:* thou art the hope of all, and my hope in particular."

We do not "rub our eyes in astonishment"—as the saying is—at such words as these, we have long since grown accustomed to them, we should no longer be surprised at anything in these matters, even if the Blessed Virgin were eventually so exalted, *à la mode Romaine*, as that it would be impossible for her votaries to address her directly, but would require an intermediator between her and them, S. Joseph to wit, who has now been advanced so that worship of him is to be of an unique character, namely of *proto-doulia*. According to the above "Novenas," the Blessed Virgin "became God"; no wonder therefore that she is likewise "the universal dispenser of all graces."

One can trace the process of all this and not be surprised to find that another addition to the Romish exaggerations was evolved: "O Mary, Immaculate Virgin and Mother, Living Light of Sanctity and Example of Purity, *scarcely wast thou conceived when thou didst profoundly adore God, and didst give Him thanks* for having by thy means removed the malediction, and poured down upon the children of Adam a copious Benediction."

With some of the above one must agree. The Virgin

was indeed an Immaculate Mother, a Virgin most pure, for That Holy Thing Which was born of her and "was conceived by the Holy Ghost," and the refinedly religious mind is revolted by the thought that she ever had children by S. Joseph; she is indeed the "Living Light of Sanctity," which shall ever shine before mankind, for "all generations shall call her blessed," the Example of Purity. We have been informed on excellent authority that the Mohammedans in Persia dare not break an engagement made on an oath taken in the name of "the Holy Mary," as they say.

But the words in italics we cannot but regard as impertinent, as heretical. Before *she had been born she adored God* and gave Him thanks. This is an echo of what happened when S. Elizabeth and the Virgin met: it is the novel dogma of the "Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin," which is contained in these words quoted from "Novenas of the Blessed Virgin," published at Dublin in 1838.

By the words "Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin" it is not meant that our Lord was immaculately conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, conceived and born without human or birth sin. This Conception and Birth of our Lord contrary to nature forms the very groundwork of the Christian Faith. But the words mean that the Virgin herself was born without birth sin, without stain, immaculately. So legends have been invented; an angel appeared to S. Ann, mother of the Blessed Virgin, and so on.

It was not without substantial grounds that Dr. Pusey made remarks on this subject in his "Letter to Canon Jelf, of Christchurch" (pub. Rivington, 1841), when he quoted from Liguori: "Again, it is of course presupposed, and

sometimes expressed, that S. Mary is a mediatrix with our Lord, that her power is derived from Him and through Him; but then, at best, it is a power absolutely vested in her; it is not the intercession of a creature, however exalted; it is the will of one whose will is complied with and *obeyed*. She stands between the soul and its Judge; it does not go to the Judge; it has but to gain the intercession of His Mother, and leave the rest to her."

In Liguori we read that the Blessed Virgin "partakes of His Omnipotence": not only this, but that our Lord has "*resigned* it to her; and this not only by her merits, but *because our Lord owes her a debt for consenting to be His Mother*, and that by giving the Virgin such *omnipotence He is only repaying her that debt*." "Because she opens at pleasure the abyss of the Divine Mercy, no sinner, however enormous his crimes may be, can perish if he be protected by Mary." "Every petition she offers *is a law emanating from the Lord, by which He obliges Himself* to be merciful to those for whom she intercedes." "The Lord, O Mary, has so exalted thee—says S. Anselm—that His favour *has rendered thee omnipotent*." "Yes—says Richard of S. Lawrence—*Mary is omnipotent*, for, according to all laws, the Queen enjoys the same privileges as the King, *and that power may be equal between the Son and the Mother*."

What must the straightforward, equally-balanced mind think of such words as we have just quoted, and of the following, but as the inculcation of an exaggerated belief in, and devotion to, the Blessed Virgin, and intrenching on the tenderness and majesty of God? "Oh, how many who deserve to be condemned by the *justice of the Son are saved by the mercy of the Mother*. Thou (Mary) art the only advocate of sinners, of all who are unprotected" (Liguori).

Dr. Pusey, in his "Eirenicon," Part II., gives many epithets of and forms of addresses to the Virgin, and the following, "Even Suarez goes beyond the Council of Trent," "The Church holds that the intercession and prayer of the Virgin are useful and *necessary* to her above all others (Saints)." For the Council of Trent only says that it is *useful*, Suarez says that "she *is* to be prayed to," because her special intercession (for of this he is speaking) is to be gained by prayer, to her this is *necessary*.

Dr. Pusey then says that we and the Romans need not differ so much as to the amount and greatness which we may well believe God did bestow upon her, nor as to the idea that she with other Saints in glory intercede for us, nor as to our asking her to pray for us, but that we cannot accept any suggestion that "God has constituted her in such sort *the* Mediatrix with Him our Mediator, that as we have no approach to God, except through Jesus, so our approach to Jesus must be through her; or, again, as all grace comes to us through Jesus alone and for His merits, so all grace is transmitted from Him through her." Neither can we accept any such idea that Jesus Christ has "delegated her as the dispensatrix of His graces (as the pictures of the Immaculate Conception represent her)—no longer, as in the representations of the catacombs, holding up her hands to God—but raining down graces upon us."

On the same page is a quotation from S. Bonaventura and Liguori: "If my Redeemer cast me off for my sins, I will throw myself at the feet of His Mother, and stay there, that she may obtain pardon for me. For she (ipsa) knows not how not to have mercy, and never knew how not to satisfy the miserable. And therefore, out of compassion, she will incline her Son to pardon me."

"'God is *just*, but Mary *merciful*';* in this Roman maxim, the worship of Mary, as the embodiment and beauteous reflection of mercy, may not be absolutely a denial of Him, but it is to sever from Him one of His choicest attributes; it is to contemplate that attribute apart from Him; it is to pour upon Mary's head the precious ointment of those warm, affectionate feelings of devotion which are the sweetest sacrifices that man can possibly offer. This was not the worship of the Wise Men of the East. When they came before 'the young Child and His Mother' they presented unto *Him* their 'gold, frankincense, and myrrh.' So again with that other argument of the polytheists, that 'the *lower gods*' are stewards of the One Supreme God, and therefore to be invoked by prayers and labial sacrifices, the same kind of answer is sufficient. We have no reason to believe Saints to be stewards of God more than are the Angels. Yet Angel-worship is prohibited. And as to the distinction between λατρεία and δουλεία, that the former—belonging to God alone—consists in *Sacrifice*, but the latter—due to created beings also—consists in any lesser worship, it is directly refuted by the rejection of the worship which S. John offered to the Angel in the last chapter of the Revelation, verse 9. For we cannot imagine that S. John prostrated himself for the purpose of offering to this Angel the Sacrifice of the Mass. Yet his worship, whatever it was, his προσκύνησις ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου, was refused by a sentence which denied equally to all Saints, and servants, and stewards, 'See thou do it not . . .

* Of course the Blessed Virgin is merciful, she who so suffered, she who was so holy, the first of all Saints and the example of womanhood. But it is in those regions where she is most worshipped, and called "Our Lady of Pity," that one sees the greatest cruelty.

worship God' ('τῷ Θεῷ προσκύνησον')" ("The Exercise of Faith," by the late Rev. Milo Mahan, D.D., pub. by G. J. Palmer, 32, Little Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C. —a little work much to be recommended).

What must be the impression on the mind of many a thinking person when he beholds the name of the Virgin used so many times more than that of our Lord? As, for instance—as we ourselves have seen—in the Church of Notre Dame-de-Bon-Secours, near Rouen, many tablets let into the walls, on which are recorded thanks for relief from sickness, etc. Now and then the thanks are acknowledged in connection with our Lord, but—say in nine cases out of ten—are engraved the words, "J'ai prié à Marie, elle m'a exaucé." One cannot but feel that people look for more mercy from the Virgin than from Christ.

In May, 1897, the writer entered the modern Cathedral of Moulins-sur-Allier. He noticed marble tablets along the walls, the marbles being intended for inscriptions commemorative of acts of mercy vouchsafed to people, a custom very admirable.

He counted *forty-eight* tablets giving thanks to the Virgin Mary; such words as these occur: "Bonne Mère vous m'avez exaucé," "Oh! ma Mère, protegez toujours," "Merci!" This last sounds rudely abrupt. In the Chapel of S. Joseph, *nineteen* tablets were inscribed to this Saint.

But in the Chapel of the "Sacred Heart," there were to be seen tablets inscribed to our Blessed Lord. How many? *Nine!* We likewise copied the following: "Promesses faites par N. S. Jesus Christ à la bienheureuse Marie Alacoque." There are eleven promises, of which this is one—the ninth—"Je bénirai même les maisons où l'image de mon Sacré-Cœur sera exposée et honorée."

After all, this is but carrying into visible practice the system generally and fashionably inculcated in the Roman community. In 1870 the late Cardinal Manning praised much an English translation of Scaramelli's "Guide to the Spiritual Life," which contains the following: "But S. Anselm makes use of a still more striking expression, when he says, that '*often Salvation is more speedily obtained by recourse to Mary than to Jesus Christ Himself.*' This is truly a 'striking expression,' in short, the love of Mary is greater than that of God the Son; seated as Empress of Heaven, she, the embodiment of widest mercy and of deepest love, *commands* her Son, Who is the personification of justice and judgment! But Anselm did not live earlier than the end of the eleventh century, and this doctrine has not the consensus of the *Early Fathers*.*

In 1832, Gregory XVI. issued an Encyclical, which contained these words: "Sed ut omnia hæc prospere ac feliciter eveniant, levemus oculos manusque ad sanctissimam Virginem Mariam, *quæ sola universas hereses* interemit. *Nostraque maxima fiducia, imo tota ratio est spei nostra.*" "But that all these things may turn out prosperously and happily, let us

* "The cultus of the Blessed Virgin is acknowledged to be of later date. Surely, then, when it is taught in authorized [Roman Catholic] books, that 'it is morally impossible for those who neglect the devotion to the Blessed Virgin to be saved,' or that 'it is the will of God that all graces should pass through her hands,' and so, that we 'can only hope to obtain perseverance through her'; that 'God granted all the pardons in the Old Testament absolutely for the reverence and love of this Blessed Virgin'; God has constituted Mary the ordinary dispensatrix of His grace; 'he who neglects Mary shall die in his sins'; surely we may ask with S. Athanasius: 'Whence, or from whom, did they learn this? Who of the fathers taught it?' Were this so, how is it that Holy Scripture speaks of the throne of our Lord only as 'the throne of grace'? how that it so inculcates on us only that He is 'the one mediator between God and man,' and speaks of no one with Him? or, how that none of the Apostles delivered this teaching to those after them, or for so many hundred years the Church knew nothing of it?" (Dr. Pusey, on the "Rule of Faith," p. 55, sqq).

lift our eyes and hands to the most holy Virgin Mary, *who alone has destroyed universal heresies. She, our greatest, is from the very depth our only reason (or cause) of hope.*" We have been brought up to believe that the Holy Spirit is the Sanctifier of the Church and the Person Who destroys heresies, and Who, by sanctifying the human mind, places therein the Christian Grace of Hope.

When Pius IX.—in his well-known Encyclical of 1849—wrote the following, did he speak in a mere extatic or piously exaggerated manner, or did he intend to convey to readers the common sense acceptance of his words?—"Ye know well, Venerable Brethren, that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most Holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fulness of all good—that accordingly we know that if there be anything in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it flows to us from her, because such is His will, Who has willed that we should have everything through Mary."

Of course it is true that all good comes to us through the Birth of Christ born of the Blessed Virgin, and, *inter alia*, that we have everything through her, but, taking the wording of Gregory XVI. and of many others, it must be supposed that the intention was to teach people that now, at the present moment, the Virgin is the central point of mercy, and that "the power between the Son and the Mother is equal; that Christ is often slow to grant, but Mary ever ready to give."

There is much interesting matter on this subject in No. 71 "Tracts for the Times," from which the following numbered quotations are taken.

1. Concerning certain Jesuistic doctrine (see pp. 19, 20 of Tract 71).

"Whether a Christian that is devout towards the Blessed Virgin can be damned?

"*Answer:* The servants of the Blessed Virgin have an assurance, morally infallible, that they shall be saved.*

"Whether God ever refuses anything to the Blessed Virgin?

"*Answer:* (1) The prayers of a Mother so humble and respectful are esteemed a command by a Son so sweet and so obedient. (2) Being truly our Saviour's Mother, as well in Heaven as she was on earth, she still retains a kind of natural authority over His Person, His goods, and His omnipotence; so that, as Albertus Magnus says, she can not only entreat Him for the salvation of her servants, *but by her motherly authority can command Him; and as another expresses it, the power of the Mother and of the Son is all one, she being by her omnipotent Son made herself omnipotent.*

"Whether the Blessed Virgin has ever fetched any out of Hell?

"*Answer:* (1) As to Purgatory, it is certain that the Virgin has brought several souls from thence, as well as refreshed them whilst they were there. (2) It is certain she has fetched many out of Hell; *i.e.*, from a state of damnation before they were dead. (3) The Virgin can, and has, fetched men that were dead in mortal sin out of Hell, by restoring them to life again, that they might repent . . .

"Again, we find in Peter Damian, a celebrated divine of the eleventh century, the following words: 'She approaches to that golden tribunal of Divine Majesty, not *asking*, but *demanding*, not a handmaid, but a mistress.'"

Another writer says: "The Blessed Virgin, for the

* But see an opposite statement by Tillemont, quoted by Dr. Littledale.

salvation of her suppliants, can not only supplicate her Son, as other Saints, but also, by her maternal authority, *command her Son*. Therefore the Church prays, 'Monstra te esse Matrem'—'Show that thou art a Mother'—as if saying to the Virgin, 'Supplicate for us after the manner of a command, and with a Mother's authority.'"

Certainly she can supplicate for us as do other Saints, and we can well believe that should any *supplications* prove more powerful than others, those would be the supplications of the most blessed, very holy, Theotokos: but *supplications* are not *commands*.

After such expressions of Jesuitic-Ultramontane theology, one may possibly, most likely, experience astonishment at the following statements and reply.

4. "The following extract is from Dr. Doyle's evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on the subject of the Roman Catholic Doctrine:—

"'The Committee find, in a treatise called "A Vindication of the Roman Catholics," the following curse: "Cursed is every goddess worshipper, that believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature, that honours her, worships her, or puts his trust in her more than in God; that honours her above her Son, or believes that *she can in any way command Him*." Is that acknowledged? *Answer:* That is acknowledged; and every Roman Catholic in the world would say with Gother, "Accursed be such person."'"

As to Gother, the prevailing Romish-Ultramontane-Neo-superstitious person may exclaim, "Nous avons changé tout cela!" The medicine of such Doctors will neither cure the wounds of the Church of Rome nor cut off the heads of the Hydra Atheism.

Chapter VI., Question III., page 4, Buckley's "Translation

of the Catechism," we read: "God and the Saints addressed differently"—"From God and from the Saints we implore assistance not after the same manner, for we implore God to grant us the blessings which we want, or to deliver us from evils; but the Saints, because favourites with God, we solicit to undertake our advocacy with God, to obtain of Him for us those things of which we stand in need. Hence we employ two different forms of prayer, for to God we properly say, *Have mercy upon us, hear us;* to the Saints, *Pray for us.*"

We find nothing objectionable in this wording; of course, God loves the holy, the penitent, and although, in His tender mercy, He loves all men, yet in a real sense He loves most the righteous.

But we have just read such phrases and words as these, that S. Mary the Virgin is "the throne of grace," that she must be praised "*infinitely*," "the creature became God," "the universal dispenser of all graces," "Mary is omnipotent," "often salvation *is more speedily attained by recourse to Mary than to Jesus*," "she being by her omnipotent Son made herself *omnipotent*," "she can *command* her Son."

Is all this in accordance with the plain reading of Tridentine literature; is all this wording that the Blessed Virgin is omnipotent, etc., etc., within the meaning of the paragraph taken from the Catechism? Do not Romish books of instruction suggest more than merely saying to the Saints, "Pray for us."

If the Blessed Virgin be omnipotent, she must either be as God, and may be invoked to give benefits *directly* of her own power, and it is lawful to go beyond the Roman theory of the Cathechism—or else she may only be asked to pray for us, and popular devotional books and practice are

heretical—or else she is not a Saint; but we regard her as the chiefest of all saints.

The Jesuit Natural Philosopher and Paduan Professor Antonio de Dominis (1556-1624), Archbishop of Spalato in Dalmatia—through whom by his co-operation in the consecration of George Monteigne, Bishop of London, on December 24th, 1617, we have a late Roman strain of Holy Orders *—De Dominis tells us from his own personal knowledge: "There is no doubt that the more ignorant people invoke the Saints religiously, and that very many are more affected internally with a religious affection towards the Blessed Virgin, or some particular Saint than towards Christ. *Neither do they invoke the Saint as one who is to pray for them*, but as one who helps them as *principal*. Nor do they say, 'pray,' but 'help, save.' Nor do they express or understand in their minds that the Saints do these things by *praying*, but that they"—*i.e.*, the Saints—"do these things by *themselves*, without any intervention, and very many, in asking them, entirely submit themselves, their whole soul, and their whole spirit, to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints, and that, too, in spiritual things, which is a form of idolatry."

De Dominis, then, says that certain people were wont to invoke some particular Saint, not as one who is to pray for them, but as one who helps them as *principal*.

On page 201 we have referred to "*direct*" invocation, and on page 210 have quoted Archbishop Bramhall on "*comprecation*" and "*ultimate*" invocation.

Let us be as careful as possible concerning the real and exact meaning of terms. Now, this word "*direct*" should be carefully

* Monteigne consecrated Archbishop Laud, on November 18th, 1661, Bishop of S. David's.

examined, as to what it does not mean, and as to what it does.

If I say to a dear friend, "N, pray for me that I may have good health and a peaceful death," there is a *directness* in my invoking, calling upon, my friend to pray for me: I speak to him straight, I address him personally.

Now, put a departed Saint in place of the living friend. Is the nature and quality of this *invocation direct?* No, it is not; it is an *indirect* invocation, although the Saint is addressed by name.

Direct invocation is when you ask the Saint to grant you something himself, making him the *principal*, giving him *ultimate* invocation, as if you should pray, "Grant me good health and peaceful death."

Of course, the invocation to a Saint worded "Give me your prayers" falls within the bounds of comprecation.

A member of the Greek Church has pointed out to the writer the importance of a word used by them, ἡ μεσιτεία. The translation given in Liddel and Scott is unsatisfactory. The English-Greek Dictionary, published at Athens in 1894, gives "mediation, intercession, interposition, *brokerage*, *brokership*."

The word "*brokerage*" is just the word we want. Our Blessed Lord is *the* One Mediator and Intercessor, as Principal, as the Almighty: we cannot do without Him. But the Saints are intercessors for us as brokers, as useful intermediaries. For example: A wishes to buy stock from B, who wishes to sell to A. A and B can transact their business, in accordance with the laws of the land, without a third party being called in. But they call in an honest broker, and he helps them to transact the affair, with less of trouble to them, for he knows more about the intricacies of business.

So with the Saints—by way of analogy. They are loving and useful friends, comprecators, and fellow-worshippers, possessing much more spiritual experience than we have been able to gain : they may be powerful helpers.

It is useless for Romans to maintain that De Dominis having "turned Protestant—as they term the process—then Roman, recanting again at the last, it is useless for them to maintain that his statement is false; the 'idolatry' took place then ; *it* takes place in our own present time."

What does one commonly behold in Churches abroad? People kneeling before the Altar of the Virgin, gazing upon an Image, on or underneath which are the words, "Je suis l'Immaculée Conception"; before the High Altar of our Lord, the Lamb Himself, hardly a single worshipper. The strange French wording, alleged to have been uttered at Lourdes by the Virgin, does not appear to strike the worshippers.

As a poet-priest of our own Church has written :—

> "The passionate acclaim of many lands
> Has drown'd thine own sweet voice, that ever spake
> Of the Lord's handmaid; now they bid thee take
> His place, and wrong thee with adoring hands;
> But oh! we know thee best when seen alone
> Far in the Past, with Jesus and with John." *

We have already said that when the Romish person is accused of frequently placing the Virgin where we say Christ should be, etc., he says that many sentences must be taken as mere pious exaggerations. We are tempted to refer again to this subject, for at this moment a copy of "The Church Review" for January 30th, 1896, lies before us. "A priest, writing to the (Roman) 'Catholic Times,'

* The Reverend Charles Tennyson-Turner.

objects to the statement that the Virgin 'first applied to our souls the Divine Blood, and signed us with the sign of the Lamb.'" The Editor (of the "Catholic Times") replies: "It seems to us that our correspondent takes the phrase too literally, and that it is no more than a periphrastic way of saying that our Lady's consent was required for the Incarnation." The sooner this periphrasticism in theology becomes extinct, the better.

This, then, is the scheme of management when an educated person expresses objection to such and similar language, the Roman reply is that the method of expression is but a roundabout way, perhaps somewhat exaggerated, of stating a fundamental truth, but, with the ignorant, the sentence—especially if from an approved writer—is produced as an authority for the unprimitive system of Virgin worship, Mariolatry.

More than once, when living in the South of France, we have had it said to us, "Mais vous ne croyez pas à la Sainte Vierge"—"You do not believe in the Blessed Virgin." In vain have we replied that it is the foundation of the Gospel that Jesus—God in the Flesh—was born of a "pure Virgin"; in vain have we shown the Anglican Prayer Book, in the French translation, pointing out the Festivals therein in honour of S. Mary: the result was merely a shaking of the head. At length the gist of the accusation was disclosed, "You do not pray to Marie." Evidently it is insufficient to pray to our Lord—they never denied we did this—but because we do not practise direct invocation to the Blessed Virgin, we are "not Christians!" This is an absolute fact, we have been informed "Vous n'êtes pas Chrétien"—we are not Christians! We venture to consider this "an object lesson," as a School Inspector would term it. No

wonder the contrast is so visible abroad of a crowd kneeling before the Lady Altar, while not a single individual kneels in silent prayer out of Service time before the High Altar. The reason is not far to seek: the worshippers believe that often salvation is more easily obtained through Mary than through Jesus; it is the white ladder *versus* the red ladder.

We remember having somewhere read that in former times the offerings at the shrine of S. Thomas of Canterbury amounted to a value of £954 6s. 3d., those at the shrine of the Virgin to £4 1s. 8d., those at our Lord's to absolutely nothing; we can quite believe it, we see the same principle going on to-day.

Of other Saints we do not now speak at length, nor care to benefit our readers by giving them a list—a list unabridged would indeed be lengthy—of those ills and maladies which may be cured by appealing to those Saints supposed to be very powerful in driving them away, each having a separate department: as, for instance, S. Clare, the special Saint to be invoked by those afflicted with sore eyes; S. Otilia, so able to drive away pains in the head; S. Giles must be prayed to by those who wish to have children, boys or girls, according to the women's wishes, as also for some celestial information as to what will be the lucky numbers in an approaching drawing of lottery tickets.

It is not only in devotional books for French and Italian Roman Catholics that exaggerations are used with respect to Saints. We find phrases in English books for English Romanists which seem to trench upon the prerogatives of our Lord, or to diminish His own peculiar glory, by joining His Name with those of human beings. As, for instance, speaking of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and S. Joseph, and addressing God the Father, it is prayed, "Grant that we

who by this blessed three implore the grace of holy living." By Jesus, Mary, and Joseph. Surely to a thoughtful, reverend, and refined mind, it cannot but often appear as an impertinence to link thus together mortals, even though of the highest rank, with Jesus, God! It is not as if the prayer were: "That following the holy example of these great Saints we implore, etc., etc., through the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord."

We do not like to think that it can honestly and intelligently be asserted that the Roman Church does in theory order her members to invoke the Saints in the sense of asking benefits and gifts directly from them—at least the Tridentine Decree does not order thus but forbids—neither do we suppose that these holy spirits would be worshipped in the sense commonly attached to the word "worship." We consider it would be absurd to accuse the intelligent and highly-bred English Romans of thus worshipping the Saints as is done abroad where Rome has full play, and we venture to suppose that they do not consider themselves bound so to do: we do not venture to assert whether they do or not.

The celebrated French Cardinal, Perrone, or Duperron (1556-1618), told Casaubon that he (Perrone) had never invoked the Saints, except he happened to form one in a procession of clergy, when he would join in singing, "Pray for us," but not otherwise. Such "invocation" we have maintained not to be uncatholic, though we may also doubt whether or not any Saint thus addressed can hear, have cognizance of, the petition; on such a point we venture to say that there should be a decent freedom permitted; but there is a vast and unbridgeable gulf between Cardinal Perrone's practice and the Mariolatry of Francis Liguori and others.

But further; not only do exaggerated ideas as to Invocation of Saints cause an eclipse of the glory due to our Lord, at least among the ignorant, but also a very offensive vulgarity in addressing various parts of the bodies of departed Saints. As an example we quote an instance. Charles Nodier refers to a curious little pamphlet of 1678. Prayer having been made to the hair of the Blessed Virgin and to her face, her ears are addressed: "Je vous salue oreilles intelligentes de Marie prés diaux de la princesse des pauvres, tribunaux de leurs requestes, salut de l'audience des misérables, université de la sapience divine, recevenses généralles des pupilles, percées des annelets de nos chaines, imperlées de nos necessités."

The cheeks of the Holy Virgin are then addressed, the mouth, the palet of the mouth, the neck: "Je vous salue col officieux de Marie, qui pliez sa teste et ses yeux sur les pitoyables objets de nos misères, canal du nouveau commerce entre le ciel et la terre, passage de communication entre la grâce et le péché, Lays de l'union mystique entre le chef et les membres de l'Eglise militante et triomphante, roseau de sucre qui dessale les âcres humeurs de la justice qui descendent sur les criminels, col à qui toutes les vertus forment un precieux rang de perles": the shoulders, the arms, the heart, etc. Further we do not quote, but refer the curious to a work published about 1520 in Paris, entitled, "Le livre de la toute belle sans pair qui est la Vierge Marie"; also to "Les Devotes Conceptions de N. D. de Seville," published at Louvain in 1539.

In a work written by a Priest of the Eastern Catholic Church we find the following statement: ". . . it must be observed that the Roman Church has erred against the First Commandment, by her errors in matters of the Faith,

as also by her unlawful innovations with respect to the administration of the Sacraments.

"She (the Roman Church) has specially erred in the matter of her novel dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the consequence of which is the deification of the Holy Virgin. Several writers of that Church, writers duly authorized to speak, Newman and Nicholas, have drawn this deduction, with the approbation of Pope and Bishops.

"Another result of this false doctrine is that the worship addressed to the Blessed Virgin has been changed in character, and has become a worship of *latria*, or adoration" (See "Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique Orthodoxe" . . . par Wladimir Guettée, Prêtre et docteur en thèologie de l'Eglise orthodoxe de Russie; Paris, Fischbacher, 33, Rue de Seine; Bruxelles, Felix Callewart Père, 26, Rue de l'Industrie: 1884).

We do not know if the Rev. Wladimir Guettée be a writer of authority, but his little work seems to have been produced with a desire to treat of things in a spirit of fairness.

But coming back to the Roman opinion that the Saints are in Heaven, *i.e.*, in that place to which the righteous shall go after the day of General Assize, let us examine this opinion by reference to the statements of one or two more Eastern theologians.

Where do the spirits and souls of the righteous go after the *immediate* or *individual* judgment?

When writing about the state and place of the happy after death, people have used so many different terms to signify this state and place that the subject has become confused.

In the fourth century S. Gregory, in his funeral sermon on S. Basil, said, "He is now in Heaven," but this term

need not be taken as meaning "Heaven" where our Lord reigns in greatest glory.

Bishop Makary, of Vinnitza, asks: "Into what place go the souls of the justified after their 'particular judgment'? In what state do they find themselves? What is their happiness there?

"With respect to place, in the Holy Scripture, as also in the writings of the holy Fathers, this place is called 'Paradise,' 'Abraham's bosom,' 'the Kingdom of Heaven,' 'the Kingdom of God,' 'the City of the Living God,' 'the Heavenly Jerusalem.'

"Likewise, according to the doctrine of the Orthodox Church, this place may be called by various names, provided it be always understood that the souls of the justified departed rest in the grace of God, and—as our Church hymns express it—'in Heaven.'

"A few writers have maintained that some difference exists between 'Paradise,' 'Abraham's bosom,' and Heaven itself."

The writer of this essay ventures to express an opinion that "Paradise" and "Abraham's bosom" mean the same place, into which the penitent thief and Lazarus both went, that is to say, on the happy side of the Intermediate State, though perhaps Lazarus did not go as far forward as the thief, because at the time of the beggar's death our Lord had not died.

Bishop Makary adds: "Although the souls" (and spirits) "of the justified, after their particular judgment, mount to Heaven and enjoy happiness there, nevertheless this happiness is not yet entire and complete: this happiness is but the foretaste of their everlasting felicity.

"In effect, the teaching of Holy Scripture that no man

shall be the recipient of the veritable and definite happiness until after the General Judgment. . . ."

The Bishop of Vinnitza then refers to certain Fathers who, while stating that it must be accepted that the justified in Heaven receive a condition of felicity immediately after their death, yet do these Fathers maintain at the same time that this happiness is not yet complete ; *e.g.*, S. Gregory.

Do not these ideas go against the Roman doctrine that the Saints are in "Heaven," *i.e.*, in that Heaven where Jesus the Christ is visibly, locally seated in glory? For there must perfection be—of course, understood that the perfection of the creature is immeasurably lower than the perfection of the Godhead—and no incompleteness can be admitted : everything before the Presence of the Alpha and Omega must be perfect and therefore complete : complete and therefore perfect.

It is with much hesitation that one ventures to speak of the position of the Saints departed, for the subject is so full of mystery, and one dreads the charge of presumption.

But may it not be permitted to say, suggest, that the Saints are exalted to the highest slopes of Paradise, and are so close to Heaven (as generally understood) that the further end of the ante-chamber abuts on to the very Throne Room of the Great King ; that they are the nearest of all the departed to the rainbow-encircled Throne ; that their prayers can be asked by, their oblations of prayer offered for, those still on earth?

And Paradise being a realm in which the keynote is preparation, and the Saints themselves being imperfect—for they are still imperfect in their condition, being without those bodies which had been sanctified in Baptism, in which they suffered martrydom, hardships, etc.—such a state and

condition would fulfil the requirements of the teaching that their great joy is incomplete, imperfect.

The Bishop continues: "Certain ancient doctors thought that the souls of the justified find themselves—until the day of the General Resurrection — not in Heaven, but more fitly, in Abraham's bosom in Paradise, which these writers considered to be the vestibule of Heaven.

"This seems to have been the opinion of these writers confined to themselves; but it likewise expressed the belief of the Church that there is no complete happiness for the justified before the General Judgment. In favour of this belief one could quote from Athanasius the Great, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Gregory."

Referring again to the expressions of opinion given by learned men at the Bonn Conference, we find, on page 65 of the authorized report, that there was a difference of opinion, or a difficulty of co-understanding, among Easterns and Westerns concerning the duty of Invocation of the Saints.

The thesis put forward was thus worded (upon which a discussion, as reported below, did follow):—

"'We acknowledge that the Invocation of Saints is not commanded as a duty necessary to salvation for every Christian.' Even Roman Catholic theologians, such as Bellarmine, Muratori, and others, do not declare the Invocation of Saints to be necessary to salvation, although it is very generally believed to be so. No objection will be raised to this proposition by the Western Church. What do the Orientals think of it? The thesis is not directed against the veneration of the Saints in general, but only against the erroneous idea that Catholics consider the Invocation of Saints to be obligatory on all.

"*Janyschew:* The Invocation of Saints has been in all

ages a prevailing and universally diffused practice in the Church, and we have no reason to oppose the practice.

"*Rhossis:* The thesis seems to contradict the Decrees of the Seventh General Council on the Invocation of Saints.

"*Reinkens:* The thesis does not deny that it is right and allowable, as the Councils declare, to venerate the Saints; it merely denies the universal obligation of the practice.

"*Janyschew:* How can a Christian discriminate between a duty and a practice recommended by his Church? It is the principle of the veneration of the Saints that we insist upon, not the Invocation of this or that Saint in particular.

"*Tatschaloff:* According to Hefele's *Conciliengeshichte* (iii. 435) the Decrees of the Seventh General Council are as follows: 'We are taught by our Lord, and the Apostles and Prophets, that we should above all others praise and revere the Holy Mother of God, who is exalted above all the powers of Heaven, and likewise the holy Angels, the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, the holy Doctors and all the Saints, and that we should implore their intercessions, which can make us acceptable to God, if we lead a virtuous life.' All the primitive Christians who separated themselves from the Orthodox Church before the Seventh General Council, the Nestorians, Abyssinians, Copts, and Armenians, hold the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints. The Protestants alone have rejected it.

"*Döllinger:* The proposition would of course excite opposition in the East; we did not expect the Orientals to accept it.

"*Howson:* Could it not, at any rate, be stated that the old Catholics agree to the clause?

"*Döllinger:* It cannot be reckoned among the theses which were universally accepted here.

"*Liddon:* The thesis is so moderately worded that even the Easterns might surely accept it. What passage is there in Holy Scripture, or what Decree of a General Council, which lays down that the Invocation of Saints is a duty necessary to salvation for every Christian? It was not held to be such a duty before the * Second Council of Nicæa, and therefore it could not be represented as such by this Council.

"*Döllinger:* I see the difficulty which the thesis presents to the Orientals. In the first place, they are not aware of the transactions that have been going on in the West on this subject between Catholics and Protestants. In the second place, they attach a decisive force, not only to the Decrees, but to all the proceedings of the Seventh General Council.

"*Janyschew:* Up to this time the Orientals and Old Catholics have been agreed as to the principle of the veneration of the Saints. The adoption of the thesis would make an agreement between them much more difficult.

"*Döllinger:* If the Orientals maintain the universal * obligation of the veneration of the Saints, there can be no consensus in this matter; for the proposition in its present form is admitted, as I have already said, by Roman Catholic theologians. But the matter must rest for the present."

It must be noted that this difference of opinion referred to the necessity, or non-necessity, of invoking Saints; the

* At the Second Council of Nicæa—called by the Greeks the Seventh Œcumenical—it was decreed: "If anyone do not recognize that all the Saints who have lived since the beginning of the world and have deserved well of God, either under the Law, or under the Law and Grace, are worthy of honour (τιμίους) before Him in soul and body, or that he should beseech the prayers of the Saints as personages having the right to intercede for the world (ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου πρεσβέυειν) according to the tradition of the Church, let such be *anathema*" (see Makary, Vol. II., 658, 671).

Easterns and Anglicans are in accord as to the non-primitive and contra-Catholic dogma whereby the Ever Blessed Virgin is practically deified.

We can join in accepting the following words of Bishop Hall, of Norwich (b. 1574, d. 1656), who has been called "the Christian Seneca": "But how gladly do we second the Angel in the praise of her which was more ours than his! How justly do we bless her whom the Angel pronounced blessed! How worthily is she honoured of men whom the Angel proclaimeth beloved of God! O Blessed Mary, he cannot bless thee, he cannot honour thee too much, that deifies thee not! That which the Angel said of thee thou hast prophesied of thyself; we believe the Angel and thee; 'All generations shall call thee blessed,' by the Fruit of whose womb all generatious are blessed."

Let us always bear in mind that there is a Catholic calling upon Saints to pray for us, such we may practise; but not with abuse or with the charge of uncatholicity must we speak of those who, like the writer, never feel it requisite or comforting thus to invoke the Saints. And more especially should we refrain from accusing those who in a proper way ask the Saints to assist them by their prayers.

We must neither assert that so to invoke Saints is a thing "repugnant to the Word of God," nor think that it is "a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture."

The *excess* of this Catholic use of Invocation has produced terrible errors, grievous idolatry, woeful profanity; but the excess of almost any good thing may do likewise. Tea is a good thing, but drinking too much tea often produces indigestion and impairs the nerves; yet would it be foolishness if tea were forbidden entry into this country.

Bishop Forbes of Brechin thus writes on this Twenty-second Article:—

"Whatever dissidence may be imagined to exist between the preceding Articles and the doctrines as propounded by the Council of Trent, there is none with regard to the subjects mentioned in the present one; for while the points formerly touched on were ruled by the Church of England subsequently to the earlier Decrees of the Council, the questions of Purgatory [which forms the title of Article XXII.] and Pardons were not discussed for many months after the publication of the Article. The Article therefore cannot be strained into a condemnation and contradiction of that which did not exist at the time; and we must come to the conviction that it was not the fomularized doctrine, but a current and corrupt practice in the Latin or Western Church which is here declared to be 'fond,' and 'vainly invented.' The distinction is a very important one. People are apt to ignore the real reformation which took place within the Latin Church, the wise and scientific treatment to which many points were subjected, and the abuses and scandal which were discountenanced. No doubt the reform might with effect have been carried further. . . . Still, a real reform did take place, and it is unscientific or uncandid to ignore it. The reform, such as it was, only came too late. . . . The points against which this Article is directed, may be discerned in many of the satires which immediately preceded the Reformation. . . . These exhibit the picture of a great decay of practical religion. Excess always leads to reaction. Superstition is closer to irreligion than men think for, and the misery is, that you can hardly prune away the one without promoting the other. Tear the ivy off the mouldering Church wall, and you will bring away part of

the wall with it. So was it at the Reformation. It was impossible to reform and not to deform; and as a fact, much that had once been good, and in time abused, was for the time lost. Solemn rites that had lost their significance . . . were cast aside as useless; edifying ceremonies . . . were ignored, doctrines . . . dropped out of sight, and a one-sided view of God's truth was advocated and enforced. This was specially the case with regard to the subject of the Article. 'The Romish doctrine,' in the earlier type of the Article, termed 'the Scholastic doctrine,' was hereby condemned. It only was condemned, but somehow people seemed to forget that besides the Romish doctrine on these subjects, there was a Catholic doctrine also; that the errors lay rather in the exaggeration and want of proportion of the statements, than in the substance, and that as formerly there had been danger from excess, there was now danger in defect, in the way of suppressing important truths of the Gospel. For on every one of the points mentioned there is an underlying Christian truth, and it is necessary to the right understanding of the Article to know what this is. We cannot tell what the Article means till we know what it condemns; and we cannot know what it condemns till we know the doctrine, the perversion of which drew forth the condemnation" ("An Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 302, etc., Fourth Edition, 1881).

In producing this book on the Twenty-second Article, the writer, or compiler, has done his best to act upon the words of the Bishop of Brechin as quoted in the last paragraph, that is, to give the Catholic origin of a Catholic truth, followed by examples showing wherein an excess has produced evil, changing a good principle into a superstition, and, frequently, a superstition into a provocative to irreligion,

the kernel of truth still remaining within the superstition.

Towards the end of his remarks on the Twenty-second Article, Bishop Forbes (pp. 420, 421) says: "Such, then, being the authorities for the practice of asking the prayers and intercessions of the Saints, even those same great Fathers who jealously guarded for us, and by their toils and sufferings transmitted to us the belief in the All-Holy Trinity and our Blessed Lord's Divine Person—such being the testimony upon which they tested it, viz., the experience of those who had sought through the Saints what God alone could give and had found it, we could have nothing, in principle, to except against it, if only those errors be guarded against, to which our poor human nature is so easily inclined, of betaking ourselves to the Saints, as to beings less holy, less awful, whom the soul ever approaches with less effort and less fear than Him Who, being our Mediator, will also be our Judge. The Council of Trent itself desired that 'all superstitions in the Invocation of Saints should be removed.'"

Bishop Forbes sums up the whole matter as follows—but in reading his concluding words it must be borne in mind that by "Heaven" we must not understand that highest circle in which Christ is now reigning:—

"In principle, then, there is no question, herein, between us and any other portion of the Catholic Church. . . . Bellarmine lays down formally these propositions—(1) We may not ask the Saints that they, as authors of the Divine benefits, would grant us glory or peace, and other means to beatitude. (2) Saints are not our immediate intercessors with God, but whatever they impetrate, they impetrate through Christ. . . . Even when the incommunicable attributes of God have, in expression at least, been invaded, the real underlying belief has been explained to be [as

Bellarmine is careful to particularize] that nothing is obtained for man, no grace, no aid, no gift for body, soul, or spirit, except through or from the One Mediator between God and man, our adorable Lord Christ Jesus.

"Prayer to the Saints in Heaven is explained, again and again, to be the same *in kind* as the prayers to the Saints on earth; as S. Augustine speaks of the cultus of the Saints in Heaven being the same in kind as the cultus of Saints on earth. 'Since the mediation of the Saints is not involved like that of Christ, since their mediation is held to be only one of intercession not of redemption, since the effectualness of this intercession rests on God's free mercy and the merits of Christ, then the honour of Christ and the aloneness of His redemption is not in the least intrenched upon. If the intercession of believers on earth may be invoked, without injury to the honour of Christ as Mediator, why not also the intercession of the Saints in Heaven?'" (pp. 442, 443).

If the Decree of the Council of Trent, or if the Catechism of the Council of Trent, do not assert that Saints *must* be prayed to, but only that asking them to pray for us is a method of communication with them, and one very beneficial to ourselves, as fulfilling in a very real manner the principle of "the Communion of Saints," then we can accept the following wording taken from the Catechism of the Council: "God and the Saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner, for we pray to God that He Himself would give us good things, and deliver us from evil things: but we beg of the Saints that they would be our advocates, and obtain from God what we stand in need of."

We can agree with the following argument, taken from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, objecting only to

the words which conclude the question, viz., the words, "in Heaven":—

"*Unitate mediatoris non officit invocatio sanctorum.*

"XXIX.—Quare si fatendum est unum nobis mediatorem propositum Christum Dominum, qui scilicet unus nos per sanguinem Patri cœlesti reconciliavit, et qui, æterna redemptione inventa, semel in sancta ingressus, pro nobis interpellare non cessat: ex eo tamen nullo modo sequi potest, quominus ad sanctorum gratiam confugere liceat. Nam si propterea subsidiis sanctorum uti non liceat, quod unum patronum habemus Jesum Christum: nunquam id commisisset Apostolus ut se Deo tanto studio fratrum viventium precibus commendari et adjuvari vellet.

"*Nota.*—Neque enim minus vivorum preces, quam eorum qui in cœlis sunt, sanctorum deprecatio Christi mediatoris gloriam et dignitatem imminuerent" (pp. 384-5).

"*The Doctrine concerning One Mediator, Christ, does not take away the Invocation of Saints.*

"Granting, we must confess, that there is but One Mediator, Christ the Lord, Who alone, forsooth, has reconciled us to His heavenly Father by His Blood, and Who, *having obtained eternal redemption*, and *entered once into the sanctuary*, ceases not to make intercession for us; it can by no means thence follow, that it is unlawful to have recourse to the Intercession of the Saints. For if, because we have One Mediator, Christ Jesus, it were unlawful to make use of the Intercession of the Saints, the Apostle would never have ventured to recommend himself with so much earnestness to the prayers of his brethren on earth, whereas the prayers of the living should derogate from the glory and

dignity of the Mediator Christ, not less than the Intercession of the Saints in Heaven."

But this reasonable, though not altogether necessary, calling upon the Saints to pray for us, is not the limit of "Invocation of Saints" according to the Romish system. In effect, more is demanded: the matter does not end with asking for the prayers of the Saints; the worshipper is driven much further on: not only are such prayers connected eventually with the subject of the Romish Purgatory, but even with the "blasphemous figments" of the superabundance of their merits, to which last subject we are forced to recur.

The remarks of Bishop Makary, of Vinnitza, again are striking on this point, marked *a*, *b*, *c* in his work.*

Referring to the pains of Purgatory (and the Romish teaching that they are inflicted so that the Divine justice may be satisfied), and speaking likewise of the application of the superabundant merits of Saints to the souls in Purgatory, the Bishop writes somewhat like this:—

"With respect to these penances, supposing that, in effect, such things exist as the superabundant merits of the Saints . . . the Latins, to support their principle, quote the words of the Saviour to S. Peter in S. Matt. xvi. 19: 'And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' etc., and refer to the example of the Primitive Church.

"Here is our reply. It is true that Peter, as all the other Apostles and Pastors of the Church (S. Matt. xviii. 18; S. John xx. 22, 23) have received the divine right (power?) to loosen sinners, to free them from their sins, as well as from the punishment due to them on account of these their sins.

* See Makary's Works (in French), Tom. II., pp. 546-7.

"But (*a*) they should not exercise this right (power?) save in the name of, and in the virtue of the merits of, Jesus Christ, from Whom they hold it, Who said to them, 'As the Father.'

"Here we cannot find the slightest allusion to the merits of Saints. The Pastors of the Church, then, have no right to declare absolution for sins in virtue of the superabundant merits of Saints."

(We omit (*b*) for lack of space.)

"(*c*) A stronger argument to show that they (the Popes?) have no right to grant Indulgences for the departed, and to loose them from their sins, and from the punishments consequent on those sins, in the Purgatory, so-called, these departed being unable to approach the Sacrament of Penance, and so unable to fulfil the conditions imposed on penitents.

"At the present time even the Latins agree that the Church cannot extend her power of absolving over the souls of the departed, and that in the instruction of our Saviour, 'Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth,' the words '*on earth*' ought to be referred as much to him who gives absolution as to him who receives it'—'doivent être rapportés tant à celui qui donne l'absolution qu' à celui qui la reçoit'" ("Instit. Catholic, in modo Cateches.," T. III., p. 307).

"For the right (power) which their Pontiff arrogates to himself of granting Indulgences to the benefit of souls in Purgatory, the Latins have no other foundation than the following reasoning: 'All prayers for the dead, the Sacrifice of the Mass, acts of charity and good works, are profitable to the departed: why should they not *profit by the superabundant merits of* Jesus Christ *and the Saints*, which may be applied to them, *per modum suffragii*, after the manner of

mediation, that is to say, on condition that there is oblation of these merits to God by the Pope?' (Perrone).*

"Yes; the merits of the Saviour, thanks to the infinite bounty of God, are able to produce a saving influence even upon the dead; it is by virtue of these" (the Saviour's) "merits that the departed gain blessings (advantage), and prayers, which the living address to Heaven on their behalf, and alms, and—above all—the Sacrifice of the Mass.

"But the result of all this is only that the Bishop of Rome, as all other Pastors of the Church—by virtue of the merits of the Saviour—can and ought to pray for the departed, particularly during the Service of the Mass, relying on the mercy of God, leaving it to the Divine Will to accept or refuse such prayers; to unloose or not to unloose sinners from these punishments due to (for) sin.

"It by no means follows that the Pope has the right (power) to give, according to his fancy, Indulgences, whereby Christian souls may be delivered from Purgatory."

NOTES TO CHAPTER V.

"The addition to the 'Ave Maria' in the English Primer was as late as 1531 and 1538 (see correspondence in 'Church Times,' 1893, pp. 906 and 949). The 'Angelus' is a devotion to God in honour of the Incarnation, and of her who was overshadowed by the power of the Highest to become its instrument. Prayer to God that you may have part in the intercessions of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints is one thing; the Roman method of Invocation, in which the Saints are addressed directly, is most dangerous, as giving to the creature the highest worship that you can offer to the Deity" ("The Church Times").

* It seems impertinent, profane, this idea that the merits of Saints can be offered to God in company with, together with, the merits of God the Son.

The Theologians and Schoolmen, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas, Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, and the Dominican Order, maintained that the Blessed Virgin was cleansed *before* her birth, but conceived according to sinful human nature. Contrary to these authors and the Dominicans, Duns Scotus and the Franciscans maintained that, by a special act of God's power, she was conceived without taint of sin. We have already referred to the untrustworthiness of Romish works, and upon this very subject of the Immaculate Conception Dr. de Bruno, in his "Catholic Belief," exhibits himself as a warning. He speaks thus:—"S. Cyprian, a Father of the third century, says: 'The Holy Spirit overshadowing her (Mary), the original fire of concupiscence became extinct, and, therefore, it was not fit that an innocent one should endure pain, nor could justice allow that that vase of election should be frustrated by the usual pains of childbirth. Because, *being very different from the rest of mankind, human nature, but not sin, communicated itself to her*'" ("De Nativitate Christi").

Not only is there no treatise of this kind by S. Cyprian, but the Benedictine editors do not even condescend to put the cited book (attributed to Arnald, Abbot of Bonneval, a friend of S. Bernard) amongst the works erroneously ascribed to S. Cyprian (see "The Church Quarterly" for July, 1881).

For our own part, of course, we cannot decide which view is correct, or if either be so: to attempt this would be ridiculous. But we can feel grieved, and our minds be in revolt, when we think how so mysterious a subject should have become the prey for disputants, and the person of the holy and pure Virgin have been the object of a discussion which, by its very nature, is so lacking in the quality of that sacred reserve with which all holy things should be treated. In our humble opinion, it seems but fitting that she, after the Holy Ghost had overshadowed her, should have been preserved from sin in a way no other human being ever had been.

We need but add now a word on miraculous revelations made on this subject of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Any assistance which might have been given to solve the difficulty at that time was withheld, from the fact that "the Saints now reigning in Heaven" received Divine communications of utterly contradictory character. Bridget—according to the Franciscans—had a revelation, proving the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and in these words

did the Blessed Virgin Mary speak to the aforesaid Bridget: "Veritas est quod ego concepta fui sine peccato originale, et non in peccato" (Bridget, Rev. lib. VI., c. 49).* Now of S. Bridget, it is declared that "*Divino afflata Spiritu Romæ quievit.*"

According to the *Dominicans*, that ever-to-be-read writer on Purgatory, S. Catherine of Sienna, was also favoured with a celestial vision, but imparting knowledge which contradicts, even denies the truth of, S. Bridget's. It is claimed for S. Catherine that she was "Vita et miraculis clara."

S. Bridget was canonized by Boniface IX. in 1391, which canonization was confirmed by Pope Martin V., at the Council of Constance; S. Catherine by Pius II. in 1461.

From which opposing opinions it may be surmised, either that both Revelations expounded truth, or that one did, and the other did not. But Ultramontane Rome has spoken; for Gregory XVI. inserted the word "Immaculatam" into the Mass of the Conception, while on December 8th, 1854, Pio Nono proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, having added to the Faith, and thus was it proved, that S. Catherine of Sienna was in error; either that she had no such vision, or that it was a vision of falsity.

According to Cardinal Manning, *exaggerations*, *anti-national sympathies*, are lawful, most admirable. In 1886 he wrote to Monsignor Talbot: "I see much danger of an English Catholicism, of which Newman is the highest type. It is the old Anglican, patristic, literary, Oxford tone, transplanted into the Church. It takes the line of *depreciating exaggerations*, *foreign devotions*, *Ultramontanisms*, *anti-national sympathies*. In one word, it is worldly Catholicism, and it will have the worldly on its side, and will deceive many."

Here we have the leading Papalissimus of the Ultramontane Communion in England striving to force foreign exaggerations upon us; we are to be Italianized, and induced to reverence and accept the revelations of Marie Alacocq, the devotions of "The Rose of Lima," or the startling and not uninteresting information concerning a portion of the Virgin Mary's early life, to be found in the "Mistica Ciudad de Dios," attributed to Maria d'Agreda, which work caused many heart-burnings in the Roman Church between 1670 and 1730. Given forth to the

*S. Bridget died in 1373. These "revelations" were vigorously assailed by the famous Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris.

world as the production of a holy nun at the revelation of the Blessed Virgin and of God, it stated, among other absurdities, that, at the age of eighteen months, the infant Mary demanded a nun's habit from her Mother S. Anne, of the colour worn by the Franciscans. She swept the house, and nine hundred angels waited on her.

Most probably this concoction was produced by one or more Franciscans in order to suggest a claim of superiority over their opponents the Dominicans. The Abbè Dufresnoy applies to this profane story the words of John of Salisbury: "Erumpit impudens et in facie erubescentium populorum genialis thori revelat et denudat arcana."

The Carmelite Order refused to accept this work, having for a long time held the opinion that the Blessed Virgin had worn a dress of their colour. Like Dr. Newman, we are inclined to object to ridiculous "exaggerations," though another, and a shorter, word would here be more suitable.

It is hardly surprising that the Italian Pio Nono did not confer a Cardinal's hat upon the Englishman, Newman, "the noblest Roman of them all," to whom similar things were, as he said, "an evil dream."

A passing word on the subject as viewed by the Catholic Orthodox Churchmen of the East.

Professor Cyriacus, in his important work on Ecclesiastical History — published at Athens in 1881 — bears witness to the fact that the Neo-Roman principles and method of Invocation were unknown to the end of the third century: "The Christians honoured and loved the Martyrs, as likenesses of Christ; and already some traces are found that they might be able to give help, either now, or in the future Judgment. Great significance was awarded to the prayers of the Martyrs for the Church but we do not meet with any example of their Invocation. Only the Martyrs were besought, before they died, to pray for the Church after their death" (p. 177).

In Mouravieff's "History of the Russian Church"—translated by the Rev. W. Blackmore, published at Oxford by Parker, 1842—on page 287, and in the note on pages 407, 408:—

"At the present time, when appear signs that a cordial interchange of ideas may be further fostered between the Eastern Catholic Churches and ourselves, a retrospective glance may be invited to a previous period when an attempt was launched to consider reunion between us, namely in 1723, untimely closed by the death of the Tzar, Peter the Great.

"It seemed to the Anglicans that the Russians 'worshipped' unduly the Saints, in a manner which really was a deification of creatures, and therefore heretical. The latter maintained that what they did was of Œcumenical authority (Second Council of Nicæa). On an examination of the subject, it was shown that but slight difference existed between us.

"On the Invocation of Saints, the Eastern Patriarchs distinctly offered not to insist on the adoption of any direct addresses by the English, but were ready to content themselves with the acknowledgment of the Intercessions of the Saints, by some allusion to, or mention of it, introduced in their prayers to God, while, of course, they expected that the direct Invocation retained in their own Offices should never be confounded with that divine worship, which indeed would be heretical to offer to any creature. The British Bishops, on the other hand, in their correspondence, fully and distinctly admitted the Intercession of the Saints, and though the death of Peter the Great prevented the continuance of the correspondence at that time, yet it is a fact, that some of the most eminent Bishops of their own Communion in England had actually done all that the Easterns insisted upon, namely, made mention of the prayers of the Saints in prayer to God; and that not only as a matter of private liberty, but in a public Service, appointed in the year 1661, in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, and at the command of the Crown, through the Archbishop of Canterbury,* to be used in all Churches on the day of King Charles the Martyr.

"The following is an extract from the said Service:—

"'We beseech Thee to give us all grace to remember and provide for our latter end, by a careful, studious imitation of Thy blessed Saint and Martyr, and all Thy Saints and Martyrs that have gone before us, that we may be made worthy to receive benefit by their prayers, which they, in Communion with Thy Church Catholic, offer up unto Thee for that part of it here militant, and yet in fight with and danger from the flesh' ('Cardwell's Conferences,' p. 388).

"The fact that such a prayer was issued by the Archbishop and the Bishops, his brethren, to be used in all the Churches of England, is sufficient proof that there was nothing in the terms offered by the Eastern Patriarchs, on the subject of the Invocation of Saints, which

* William Juxon.

need have thrown any impediment in the way of the establishment of unity—on this point – between themselves and the British; inasmuch as these latter had, in fact, already done the very thing that was desired of them; while their own offer to make 'a solid union' with the Eastern Church, although she should persist in retaining the whole system, which they rejected for themselves as creature-worship and idolatry, was a virtual abandonment of those charges" (Mouravieff, Note on page 408).

At the same time, we must honestly face the following words: "Our Lord is the Mediator of our reconciliation, but the Saints and the Mother of God for post-Baptismal forgiveness and for deliverance from ordinary evils." And Mr. Athelstan Riley presents to us, as "excellently describing the Catholic position," a statement of the above-quoted Mouravieff, including the words: "The Orthodox Church, since the earliest ages of Christianity, has glorified the Blessed Virgin . . . supplicating her as the most powerful mediatrix with the Lord."

In the "Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Union" of 1895, and in the twelfth section of that important document, are these words: "The one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of the Seven Œcumenical Councils, walking according to the divinely-inspired teaching of the Holy Scriptures and the old Apostolic tradition, prays and invokes the mercy of God for the forgiveness and rest of those 'which are fallen asleep in the Lord'" (S. Matt. xxvi. 31; Heb. xi. 39; 2 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Macc. xii. 48); "but the Papal Church, from the twelfth century downwards, has invented and heaped together in the person of the Pope, as one singularly privileged, a *multitude of innovations* concerning *purgatorial fire, a superabundance of the virtues of the Saints, and* the *distribution of them to those that need them*, and the like, setting forth also a *full reward* for the just *before* the *universal resurrection and judgment*."

We have quoted this before: it is of much importance.

The next section protests against the "*novel* dogma concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God and ever-Virgin Mary, which was unknown to the ancient Church, and strongly opposed at different times, even by the more distinguished among the Papal theologians" (see English Translation, edited by the Very Reverend Archimandrite Eustathius Metallinos, Priest of the Greek Church of the Annunciation in Manchester).

May God, in His loving mercy, grant that our relations with the Orthodox Churches of the East may grow in cordiality, and mutual love increase, both East and West, both rejecters of Papal arrogance and of Romish novelties, uniting, after careful examination, striving to bring to pass that state when there shall be one fold and One Shepherd, Jesus Christ, the "Bishop and Shepherd of your souls."

We echo the spirit of Archbishop Wake, of Canterbury: "Nos interim Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ veri episcopi ac clerus, uti in omnibus majoris momenti articulis eandem vobiscum fidem profitemur, ita eodem spiritu ac affectu vobiscum (quoniam aliter tam longe a vobis dissiti non possumus), communicare non desistemus: omniaque vobis felicia atque pacata precari" (Archbishop Wake's Letter to Chrysanthus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, written September, A.D. 1725).

With our Book of Common Prayer before us to show us the mind of our Church as to the duty of honouring the Saints and glorifying God in them, we note that the "Magnificat"—that grand, simple, trusting, inspired Song of the Theotokos, "the Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary"—can be said daily, that no fewer than five Festivals or Commemorations are therein to her honourable memory, viz.: on February 2nd, "The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, commonly called The Purification of Saint Mary the Virgin," with special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, while in the Kalendar itself this Feast is entitled "Purification of the Virgin Mary"; on March 25th we have "The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary," with special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

Towards the beginning of the Prayer Book, in the "Lessons Proper for Holy Days," coming after the Festival of S. Matthias, we see "Annunciation of our Lady."

In "The Calendar" which immediately follows—a portion of our Prayer Book concerning which so many Church people are strangely ignorant—we are bidden to commemorate on July 2nd the "Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary," that is to say, when we are to bear in mind the visit she paid to S. Elizabeth, the mother of S. John the Baptist. On September 8th we commemorate the "Nativity of the Virgin Mary."

(On July 26th, S. Anne, mother of the Blessed Virgin, is commemorated.)

Bearing this in mind, and remarking that we have nineteen Festivals in honour of Apostles and Saints individually named, or noted (and

over fifty Commemorations in the Kalendar), on every one of which Festivals the Holy Eucharist is to be celebrated, we must feel that the Church bids us regard them not only as the fruits of God's goodness, or as the brightest examples of Christ's soldiers, but also as fellow beings, and as worshipping members still of the universal Church, joining with us in offering to God the Father the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Lamb, we and they thus uniting on earth and in Paradise with the continual Offering of our Lord Himself in the Heaven of Heavens in the Form of glorified Manhood, the God-Man, Jesus, the High Priest and the Victim, "the Lamb as It had been slain."

We feel bound to do them honour, to venerate their blessed names and holy lives; we feel we must raise them far above us; more especially to love, "with all but adoring love," her who is blessed above all women, yea, above the whole human race, the holy, the meek Theotokos, the Mater Dei in Human Flesh.

And we see no reason to feel dissatisfied, or unsatisfied, with such a reasonable richness.

Says Bishop Pearson: "We believe the Mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after His Birth, but also for ever, the most Immaculate and Blessed Virgin. . . .

"Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, which is incommunicable to any other. We cannot bear too reverenced a regard unto the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto God Himself."

Also does that most learned divine, Bishop Andrewes, write: "Making mention of the All-Holy, undefiled, and most-blessed Mary, Mother of God and ever-Virgin, with all Saints, let us commend ourselves and each other, our whole life unto Christ our God."

Bishop Jolly (1756-1838) did thus speak with respect to her: "The Blessed Virgin Mother is undoubtedly the most highly exalted and honoured of all creatures. . . . All generations, according as her divine Canticle foretold, do call her Blessed. And certainly the highest honour that can be paid to a creature is due to her."

And yet, there are people so foolishly ignorant that they will not have in their hymn books the line, "Jesu, Son of Mary, hear," but must, forsooth, change this wording into "Jesu, Son of David, hear." Now, Jesus was the Son of Saint Mary the Virgin in a way in which He was not the Son of David. Many non-Christians would accept as

history that Jesus was a descendant of the King of Israel, who do not accept the necessary doctrine that Jesus was the Son of Saint Mary "the Virgin."

At the risk of incurring the charge of prolixity, we quote some paragraphs from "Twenty-five Years of S. Andrew's," by that genial Presbyterian minister, Dr. Boyd ("A.K.H.B."), written in connection with the introduction of the Scottish Hymnal.

"In a day or two I received a threatening letter from a conscientious man (who had vehemently opposed the *Te Deum*) announcing that he, with one or two more, were to 'rouse the country' against the book, on the ground that it contained the familiar 'Jesus, Son of Mary, hear.' I did not think the decent man could arouse anybody, not even the congregation which had to listen to his preaching, and I replied that he might do his worst.

"As Holy Scripture says 'Mary, the Mother of Jesus,' this appears to imply 'Jesus, the Son of Mary.' I heard no more. I have no doubt he did all he could. The same intelligent man objected to the Blessed Virgin being described as *mild*. He appeared to think it possible that She, from whom our Saviour took His beautiful perfection of human nature, might have been a Termagant.

"A truly good but very stupid person wrote me that it was an awful thing that in Dean Milman's famous verses our Saviour was six times described as *Son of Mary*, but never once as *Son of God*. I tried to get him to understand that the fact that a prayer was addressed to Him at all implied that He was Divine, and that the obnoxious words conveyed that the present appeal was to His real and sympathetic Brotherhood in poor Humanity. He saw it not. All he knew was that the Mediæval Church had made too much of the Virgin; and so the Kirk ought to refuse Her any respect whatever. The fights over that line in the Committee had been terrible: curiously, the ministers whose Churches were nearly empty being the most Protestant. Those whose Churches had been empty when they preached, and crowded when their Curates preached (the Curates being now members of the Committee, and strongly Catholics), were the most Protestant of all. Here was a chance of paying off an old score. I remember the last word. An illiterate and pettifogging member stated that the line in question tended directly to Mariolatry. Whereupon the mild Dr. Robertson, of Greyfriars, started up, his face flushed with wrath for the *second* time

in his life, and exclaimed, 'Only if our congregations consist exclusively of born idiots.'"

We need not go North of the Tweed to find people equally illiterate (and replete with vulgarity to boot, for the Scotch are never vulgar), they are not few in the kingdom lying South of that famous river.

On the other hand, we have heard young men, members of the Church of England, speak unadvisedly about their "great devotion to our Lady," without due reflection concerning the various qualities of "devotion"; these are frequently youths who seem to think that the having a blue lamp hanging before a side, or Chapel Altar, is a specific mark of Catholicity; we have known this to be rather a signal of ignorance, of ignorance quite unconscious, of course.

The following quotation from Father Paul Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent" may prove not uninteresting to some; the lines are taken from Book II., pp. 180-182, in Brent's translation:—

"The Prelates . . . with the Divines . . . conferred on these Articles . . ." sin and concupiscence remaining from Adam ". . . almost all, adding and taking away what they thought fit with much concord, but only that the *Franciscan* Bishops and Friars approved not, that it should be generally said, that the sin of Adam passed into all mankind, because the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of our Lord, was comprehended, if she were not particularly excepted; and they desired the exception. The *Dominicans* said, on the contrary, that the proposition so general and without exception was Saint Paul's and all the holy Doctors, and therefore that it was not fit to alter it with an exception; and that contradiction waxing warm, they fell into the question which the Legates had often turned aside. They said that though the Church had *tolerated* the opinion of the Conception, yet he that would examine the matter might well find that she was not exempted from the common infection. And the others opposed that it would be as much as to condemn the Church who celebrateth the Conception as Immaculate, and a kind of ingratitude, derogating from the honour due unto her by whom all the graces of Christ pass unto us. The disputations turned into contention, so far, that the Emperor's Ambassador had hope to obtain his design, that the matter might not be proposed in the next Session.

". . . It is necessary to relate from the beginning the origin of the controversy. After that the impiety of Nestorius had divided Christ, making two Sons, and denying Him to be God Who was born of the

Blessed Virgin, the Church—to inculcate the Catholic truth in the minds of the faithful—made often mention of her in the Churches, as well of the East as of the West, with this short form of words in the Greek, *Maria Θεότοκος*; in Latin, *Maria Mater Dei*. This, being instituted only for the honour of Christ, was, little by little, communicated also to the Mother, and finally applied to her alone; and, therefore, when images began to multiply, Christ was painted as a Babe in His Mother's arms, to put us in mind of the worship due unto Him, even at that period. But, in progress of time, it was turned into the worship of the Mother without the Son, He remaining as an appendix in the picture. The writers and preachers, especially those that were contemplative, *carried with the torrent of the vulgar—which is able to do so much in these matters*—leaving off to mention Christ, invented with one accord new praises, epithets, and religious services, insomuch that, about the year 1050, a daily Office was instituted to the Blessed Virgin, distinguished by seven Canonical hours, in a form which anciently was ever used in honour of the Divine Majesty, and in the next hundred years the worship so increased that it came to the height even of attributing that unto her which the Scriptures speak of the Divine Wisdom. And among these *invented novelties* this was one, her total exemption from original sin. Yet this remained only in the breasts of some few private men, having no place in Ecclesiastical ceremonies or among the learned. About the year 1136 the Canons of Lyons dared to bring it into the Ecclesiastical Offices. Saint Bernard, who lived in those times, esteemed the most learned and pious of that age, who was most frequent in the praises of the Blessed Virgin — so far as to call her 'the neck of the Church,' by which every grace and influence passeth from the head—severely inveighed against the Canons, and wrote unto them, reprehending them for introducing a dangerous novelty, without reason, or example of antiquity; that there want not places to praise the Virgin, who cannot be pleased with a presumptuous novelty, mother of rashness, sister of superstition, daughter of lightness. The next age had School Doctors of both Orders, Franciscan and Dominican, who in their writings refuted this opinion, until about the year 1300, when John Scott, a Franciscan, putting the matter into disputation, and examining the reasons, did fly to the omnipotency, saying that God had power to free her sin, or to cause sin to remain in her for an instant only, or for a

certain time; that God alone knoweth which of these three be true; yet it is possible to attribute the first to Mary—if this be not repugnant to the authority of the Church, and of Scripture. The doctrine of this famous divine was followed by the Franciscan Order. But in the particular of the conception, seeing the way laid open, they affirmed absolutely for true that which he had proposed as possible and probable, under the doubtful condition, *if it be not repugnant to the Catholic Faith*. This doctrine the Dominicans did constantly resist, following S. Thomas, one of their Order, famous for his learning, and for the approbation of of Pope John XXII., who to depress the Franciscans—who for the most part adhered to the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, excommunicated by the Pope—did canonize the Doctor and his doctrine. The show of piety and devotion made the Franciscan opinion generally more accepted, and more tenaciously received by the University of Paris, which University was held in much repute on account of its eminent learning; and after long ventilation and discussion, was afterwards approved by the Council of Basel, which forbade that the contrary should be preached and taught. This took place in those countries which accepted the Council. Finally Pope Sixtus IV., a Franciscan, made two Bulls in this matter, one in 1476, sanctioning a new Office . . . with Indulgences to those who celebrated or assisted it; the other in 1483, condemning, as false and erroneous, that is heresy, to hold the conception, or a sin to celebrate it, excommunicating the preachers and others who noted that opinion of heresy, or the contrary, because it was not as yet decided by the Church of Rome and the Apostolic See. . . . The Dominicans grounded themselves upon the Scripture, the doctrine of the Fathers, and the most ancient Schoolmen, where not one iota was found in favour of the others; but they alleged miracles for themselves, and the contentment of the people. John of Udine, a Dominican Friar, said: 'Either you believe, and are willing to accept, that Saint Paul and the Fathers have believed in the exemption of the Virgin from the common condition, or not. If they have believed in it, and yet have spoken generally—without ever having made mention of this exception, imitate them also at the present time. But if they did believe contrariwise, your opinion is a novelty.' Jerome Lombardellus, a Franciscan Friar, said that the authority of the present Church was no less than that of the Primitive Church; if the consent of the former made men in those times speak without exception, the consent

of the present Church, which appeareth in celebrating the Feast throughout, this fact ought to induce us not to omit it."

Of S. Anne. "Archbishop Whately ventured on the forecast, that in time S. Anne would take the place of the Blessed Virgin, in the supplications of the Roman Church; that as the Saviour is considered too highly exalted to be perpetually approached, so would it be with regard to Mary, and then her mother would be addressed in their prayers. I have been reminded of this by reading in your columns of the Auray Pilgrimage. From this it looks as if the Archbishop's forecast is likely to prove a correct one. I refer specially to the petitions to S. Anne, taught by the Bishop of Vannes on that occasion: 'Mother of our country, most powerful Anne, be thou saving of thy Bretons, preserve their faith, strengthen their practice, obtain for them peace by thy holy intercession.' And then your correspondent gives us extracts from the sermon then preached by a Jesuit: 'Naught after Mary is so precious as S. Anne, for naught after Jesus is so precious as Mary. The greatness of the Son is the measure of the greatness of the Mother. What think you, then, must be the greatness of S. Anne?' And again, 'The true Breton, whose mother is S. Anne, keeps himself pure. . . . Others may betray God, and His Christ, and His Church, and the Virgin, and S. Anne, my Breton, yet not I'" (From "The Church Times").

The cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary. "While acknowledging the force of the argument against the cultus of the Blessed Virgin drawn from the silence of the ancient Liturgies, there is, I think, a yet more powerful one to which you have not adverted, and which I myself have overlooked in my 'Plain Reasons.' It is that not only is the cultus absent from the Church, even when, like S. Proclus, they use the strongest terms of reverent affection towards Our Lady, but that it first began, so far as we know, in a thoroughly heretical and disreputable quarter.

"It was Peter the Fuller, intruding Patriarch of Ephesus, in the fifth century, who combined in his teaching the heresies of the Eutychians, the Valentinians, the Apollinarists, and the Sabellians, and whose personal character stands even lower than his orthodoxy, who first appointed that mention should be made of the Blessed Virgin in all prayers.

"Tillemont's remarks on this fact (Mem. XVI., 376) are characteristic-

ally Roman, moderate though he was. He says: 'Thus it may be seen that devotion to the Virgin, which is holy in the Saints, is found also in the most wicked, and is not a very certain mark of their predestination. . . . The manner in which Nicephorus speaks of these four things established by the Fuller gives ground for believing that they have continued ever since in the Greek Church, as they have partly been received by the Latin one, the Church having been accustomed to judge matters of this sort as they are in themselves, and not by the character of those from whom they come.'

"A sounder induction, surely, is that a practice which contradicts both the letter and spirit of Holy Scripture, which is unknown to the earliest ages of Christendom, which is branded as a heresy when it first appears, and whose final acceptance is due to the influence of one of the most infamous men of his time, of whom Tillemont says that he was a murderer and tyrant, with no fear or reverence of God's laws, is in itself of a very doubtful character and utility" (Letter to "The Church Times," dated August 22nd, 1881, and signed "Richard F. Littledale").

CHAPTER VI.

Concerning Images.

CONCERNING the words "Worship," "Adoration," we have already spoken.

In considering this subject of the worshipping and adoration of Images—as on other points connected with Romish exaggerations, objected to in Article XXII.—we are reminded of Dr. Newman's words, in his "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" (1875), wherein he speaks of "the *chronic extravagances* of knots of" (Roman) "Catholics."

By "Images" are to be understood figures, whether carved, sculptured, or painted on any material.

N.B.—εἴδωλον, idol; a representation of something fancied; εἰκών, image; a representation of something real.

The very word Icon (εἰκών) implies an image, something like, but falling short of the person portrayed; it must represent that person generally, not realistically.

In the very earliest period of the Christian Church there was a natural objection to the presence of Images in Churches, because the ignorant or foolish might be unable to dissociate them in their minds from those of the heathen gods or goddesses, or of the lesser tutelary deities.

The first images were symbolical of our Lord: these

were paintings, sculptured images followed later. These pictures were introduced between 400 and 500 A.D., a very proper, useful, and artistic addition, as long as they were not unlawfully used.

There is indeed a work, professing to be a Confession of Faith, in the Epistle of Basil to Julian the Apostate (339-363), in which the worshipping of Images (in the exaggerated sense) is given as being amongst most important points of the Christian Faith, but Dupin acknowledges that this document is a forgery—only one among many, alas!

To consider and regulate upon discipline, a Council met at Elvira, or Eliberis,* in Spain, in the year 305 (?). In its Thirty-sixth Canon it was decreed, "placuit picturas in ecclesiis esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur," deciding against the introduction of Images in Churches. But it must be remembered that the Church in her very earliest days had to contend against Paganism with its gross idolatry, which for a long time had lingered on, and she was obliged to discountenance certain things, lest her services might, in some respects, bear any similarity to heathen surroundings. And if the Latin words mean that pictures were "worshipped"—with the usual meaning—the fault did not lie with the paintings themselves, but in the idolatrous use of them; to reject all works of art on this score would be as illogical as (to quote James II.) to refuse to wear shoes, because Papists wear them; certainly, the Lutheran Protestants would be very much surprised and disgusted if they were forbidden to have Crucifixes in their place of worship, just because in the Roman Church it is claimed that certain of their Crucifixes have worked miracles. We may be quite sure that no image is unduly

* Not the town of this name in Catalonia, but that in the province of Granada.

worshipped in any Church of the Anglican Communion.

Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles (599?), likewise spoke against Images, because they were unlawfully looked up to.

It was in 692 that a Council was held in the palace at Constantinople, which Council is known as "in Trullis,"* or "in Trullo," so called from the Trullos, or *Cupola*, which adorned the building. The Eighty-second Canon forbids the representation of Christ under the form of a Lamb. The Trullan Council also ordered that where Christ was shown in His connection with the Cross He should be represented in His Human Nature ("Encyc. Britt.").

And the wording of the Eighty-second Canon of this "*Quinisextum*" Council—as it is also called, being a supplement to the Fifth and Sixth General Councils—shows us that its order respecting the use of the Crucifix was based upon the reasonable principle that that which fulfils is greater than that which foreshadowed, the antitype greater than the type; hence its decision whereby the Lamb "That taketh away the sins of the world" should give way to the Form of our Lord, and that It should be in the form of an Icon, or stiff representation. And this is the wording of the Canon: "*Τὸν τοῦ αἴροντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν κόσμου Ἀμνοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸν ανθρώπινον χαρακτῆρα καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰκόσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀντί τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἀμνοῦ αναστηλοῦσθαι οριξομεν.*" In Latin wording: "Ut ergo quod perfectum est vel colorum expressionibus omnium oculis subjiciatur, ejus qui tollit peccata mundi, Christi Dei nostri, humana forma characterem etiam in imaginibus deinceps, pro veteri agno, erigi ac depingi jubemus."

It was in the eighth century that the notorious contests took place between the Iconduli, Iconolatræ—*i.e.*, Image

* Greek *θόλος* = an arched roof, a dome.

worshippers — and the Image destroyers, Iconmachi, or Iconoclastæ (Russian = Iconbortzi).

In 726 or 730, in a manner much lacking discretion, and objectionable in the extreme, which marked the proceedings, the Eastern Emperor Leo III. ("the Isorian," A.D. 717-741) issued an edict against Icons or Images, with the result that terrible contention and many murders took place. The edict was opposed to the fanatical zeal of the Iconolatri, but was itself guilty of that fanatical spirit which marked the Emperor's opponents; it objected to Images even in the light of works of art, referring to "the godless art of painting"—a peculiarly ignorant and Puritanic absurdity. Dr. Cyriacus says, however, that the action of Leo was intended to put away any circumstances which might hinder the Jews' conversion—their dread of "idols" being naturally very lively.

The Synod of Constantinople — A.D. 754, at which three hundred or three hundred and thirty-eight Bishops were present — decided against the undue superstitious worshipping of Images. Although summoned by the Emperor Constantine V. ("Copronymus"), the matter was decided by the Eastern Church in Convocation, the decision against Images being somewhat in the following strain: "Confirmed by these writings of God's inspiration, and the sentiments of the Holy Fathers, and fixing our feet firmly on the rock of worshipping God in spirit, in the name of the Holy and life-giving Trinity, we being unanimous and of one sentiment, assembled together, with one voice decree, that every image, of whatever materials, made by the evil art of painters, is to be cast away from the Church as strange and abominable. Let no one, whoever he may be, hereafter follow so unholy and impure a practice. And

whoever from this day shall dare to procure for himself an image, or to worship it, or to set it up either in the Church, or in a private house, or to keep it in secret, if he be a Bishop or deacon, let him be deposed; if he be a hermit or a layman, let him be anathematized, and subjected to the imperial laws, as one who sets himself against the divine decrees, and does not observe the ordinances."

By its members this Council was styled the "Seventh General Council," but the Second Council of Nice maintained that it was unauthorized and heretical: Bishop Hefele calls it "The mock-synod of Constantinople." The above quotation is from the Second Council of Nice (Article VI), which treated of the previous Council's Acts, sentence by seutence, to which treatment we owe the account of the Decrees of this Constantinopolitan meeting.

In 767, Pepin le Bref (son of Charles Martel), first King of the Carlovingian dynasty (d. 768), held a Council at Gentilly (Gentiliacum)—a small town on the Bièvre, south of Paris. It was decided that Images were to be permitted, and that they were useful, but "worship" was forbidden, and the principle of Images, as held by Gregory the Great, seems to have been accepted.

But in 787, about three hundred Bishops, under the Patriarch Tarasius, attended the Second Council of Nicæa, Pope Adrian and Irene—regent of the Eastern Empire—having arranged between them that such an one should take place. It decided exactly opposite to that of Constantinople in 751, ordering "obeissance" (*ἀσπασμός*) to all sacred Images, the framers of the Decree declaring that those who pretended to *honour* Images, without worshipping them, were guilty of hypocrisy, but that the external and inferior worship should not be confused with that true and supreme worship or

formal adoration (*πίστις αληθινή λατρεία*) due to God alone.

But the Iconduli were hardly wise in quoting the following texts, as proofs in favour of their views: "Like as we have heard so have we seen" (Psalm xlviii. 8). "Let me see thy countenance, let me hear thy voice; sweet is thy voice, and thy countenance is lovely" (Canticles ii. 14).

When the Emperor Michael III. arrived at full age he objected to Image worship, whereon—so it is recorded—his mother ordered his eyes to be thrust out. The Council of 787 is frequently considered to be the "Seventh Œcumenical Council."

In the Tridentine Meeting the Decree of this Council of Nicæa was referred to as authoritative in the matter of Images. But it so happened that this "Seventh General Council" did renew the condemnation passed on Pope Honorius by the Sixth General Council held at Constantinople in 681, a condemnation renewed by every Pope of Rome at his enthronization for nearly a thousand years after, a record which, for the sake of convenience of a certain kind, was eliminated from the Roman Breviary in the sixteenth century. If the Council of 787 possess so authoritative a character in the matter of reverence of Images, so should it also in the matter of condemning a Pope as a heretic — who nevertheless must have been infallible in matters appertaining to faith and morals! The Council of 787 has never been explicitly accepted as a General Council by the Church of England since the Reformation, but its Decrees may be binding so far as they form part of the General Canon Law.

In the beginning of the year 842 Images were re-erected in Churches, and the occasion is commemorated under the title of "*πανήγυρις τῆς ορθοδοξίας*," or "the triumph (or festival)

of orthodoxy," at which date, by such re-erection, the "Seventh General Council" was finally accepted.

"Ο ἀπερίγραπτος Λόγος τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκ σοῦ, Θεοτόκε, περιγράφη σαρκόυμενος, καὶ τὴν ρύπωθεῖσαν εἰκόνα εἰς τὸ αρχαίον αναμορμώσας, τῷ θείῳ κάλλει συγκατέμιξεν. Αλλ' ὁμολογοῦντες τῆν σωτηρίαν, ἔργῳ καὶ λόγω ταύτην ἀνιστοροῦμεν." The following is the translation: "The uncircumscript Word of the Father, taking flesh of thee, O Theotokos, was circumscribed, and having restored the soiled image to its primal form, made it partaker of the Divine beauty. So, then, in confessing our salvation in word and deed, it is this which we recall to memory."

These words are found in the *Contachion* for "Orthodox Sunday." The *Contachion* is a species of short hymn, first used by the Deacon Emissenus about A.D. 500. "Orthodox Sunday" is an Eastern name for the first Sunday in Lent.

We shall lose the chief point contended for in these Image controversies if we fail to notice this very important fact, that the zeal of the Orthodox party against the Iconoclasts was promoted by antagonism to the *Rationalism* which underlay their objection to the religious use of Images.

This being so, we may understand Trench when, in his "Lectures on Mediæval History," he says: "No one will deny that, with rarest exceptions, all the religious earnestness, all which constituted the quickening power of a Church, was ranged upon the other [*i.e.*, the Orthodox] side. Had the Iconoclasts triumphed, when their work showed itself at last in its true colours, it would have proved to be the triumph, not of faith in an invisible God, but of frivolous unbelief in an incarnate Saviour."

The visit of Charles the Great to the Monastery of Monte Cassino in 787 produced unexpected results, causing him to plan his system of education under the direction of the more

intelligent and best instructed clergy, which might have produced a Renascence of learning under other circumstances, and from which eventually sprung the "Schoolmen," or "School-authors."

In, or about, A.D. 790 appeared the Four Books, or Treatises—the "Opus Carolinum, or IV. Libri Carolini"—written, or edited, by the celebrated learned English scholar Alcuin, the "Caroline Books" being so called because "Carolus" is the Latin for "Charles." Bishop Hincmar, of Rheims, says that he himself saw these works in the Imperial Palace.

We now draw attention to a Council held by Charles the Great, in 794, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, when the Franks did not hesitate to find fault with the Second Council of Nicæa, which—so it was stated—had been presided over by the Bishop of Rome, in the persons of his legates, his chief presbyter, and Peter; other Patriarchs do not seem to have attended this meeting. This meeting was perhaps called together because in 790 Hadrian I. had sent to Charles the Nicæan Acts.

Images were certainly to be allowed, but worship of them was not to be enforced, neither were they to be forbidden or destroyed—"imagines non ad orandum, sed ad memoriam rerum gestarum et parietum venustatem habere permittimus." The advice of Gregory the Great seems to have been followed by this Council with regard to Images, which were to be admitted for the instruction of the unlearned, that devotion might be quickened, and that they formed suitable decoration for Churches.

No fewer than three hundred Bishops were present from Italy, France, Germany and Britain. As already stated, the Second Council of Nicæa was protested against, and all

those who rendered to any Image "*servitium* aut adorationem" were anathematized, the Nicæan Council being declared a packed assembly, not a General Council, and the Frankfort meeting upheld the Franks in their principles, as expressed in the Caroline Books.

We have heard it stated that we eventually accepted the Second Nicæan Council as the Seventh General Council, and that the objection to Images was only an objection, "imaginibus ita ut deificæ Trinitati servitium aut adorationem impendere," remembering also that the Second Nicæan forbids *πίστις αληθινή λατρεία* unto any Image.

Not having at hand the means of discussing this point fully, we can simply leave it open, contenting ourselves with suggesting that it is indeed very possible that the Council of Frankfort was wrongly informed as to the enactment of the Second Council of Nicæa, namely, having been told that the Nicæan had ordered that those who failed to pay to the Images of Saints service " or adoration, in the same way as the Deific Trinity, should be adjudged anathema." *

Dean Milman gives the following translation of the Canon concerning Images, ratified by the Nicæan Council: " With the venerable and life-giving Cross shall be set up the venerable and holy images, whether in colours, in mosaic-work, or any other material, within the consecrated Churches of God, on the sacred vessels and vestments, on the walls, and on tablets, on houses, and in highways—the images, that is to say, of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of the Immaculate Mother of God, of the honoured Angels, of all Saints and holy men. These images shall be treated as holy memorials, worshipped and kissed, only without that

* During the Image worship controversy the term "Adoration" was confined to the action of bodily prostration. In the Caroline Books a protest was entered against identifying *osculare* with *adorare*.

peculiar adoration which is reserved for the Invisible, Incomprehensible God."

Possibly, indeed probably, the Frankfort Council thought that "*proskunesis*" meant what we understand commonly by "adoration," as to various applications of which term we have already spoken on page 204, etc. But in its ruling the Council was careful to distinguish between that supreme worship latria (λατρεία) due to God, and that worship of honourable reverence due to the Blessed Virgin and Saints the Council certainly did not hold that *latria* was due to the Cross; and with equal certainty the Romish people and books which, ordering latria to be paid to the Cross, refer to this Second Council of Nicæa as an authority, in so doing are either chargeable with ignorance, or guilty of a gross perversion of truth.

It is to be remarked that a great objection was raised by the Council of Frankfort to the worshipping of Images, because thereby such Images were made to be equal to the presence of the Lord's Body and Blood in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, which are ever to be worshipped. "The Council of Frankfort, as is notorious, was very plain and express in the condemnation of Image worship. Their second Canon is: 'The question was mooted of the recent Synod of the Greeks holden at Constantinople * touching the worship of Images, wherein it was set down that such as would not pay service or worship to the Images of the Saints as to the Holy Trinity should incur an anathema.

* The fact that the Council of Frankfort spoke of the Second *Nicæan* Council as having taken place at *Constantinople* suggests that the Council may not have been correctly informed on certain points, *e.g.*, the sense of the wording in which the Eastern Council framed its Canons, and that when it spoke of honouring Images *(proskunesis)* the Carlovingian Council understood supreme worship *(latria)*.

Our holy Fathers above mentioned rejected altogether such adoration and service, and that with scorn, and unanimously condemned it.' And one of their reasons for rejecting it—alleged afterwards to Pope Adrian—was: 'It is great rashness and extreme absurdity to be minded to put the said Images on an equality with the Body and Blood of our Lord.' Herein they adopt the argument of the Iconoclasts, whose decisions they had before them, embodied in those of Nicæa, and show that they regarded it as a matter of course to adore Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, since otherwise the adoring of Images would be no intrusion on the rights of that Sacrament" (Quoted from Keble's "On Eucharistic Adoration," p. 112, Second Ed., 1859).

From which two things may be seen. Firstly, that the learned people of those times in the Council considered the "*adoration*" alleged to be due to Images was a real, full, and absolute "adoration," as generally understood by the term; secondly, that they saw no distinction between this "adoration" promulgated by the Nicæan Council of 787 as due to Images, and that paid from the earliest times of the Primitive Church universally to the Presence mystically and actually present after a certain point in that Service of the Holy Mysteries.

And we who have travelled much abroad defy any Roman Catholic to assert with truth that a very large section of their communion can, or do, distinguish between "adoration" and "adoration."

Under the reign of Charles' son, Louis the Pious (814-840), an embassage was received from the Eastern Emperor Michael II. (Balbus) to consider the Image question. It was in 824-5 that a Council was held in Paris wherein the principles of the Caroline Books were upheld, and the

subject of Image worship once again examined and discussed, and now by the most learned clergy of those times. The Bishops drew up a document in which the extremes of both parties of Image worshippers and Image destroyers were censured. As the Caroline Books had done, so did the Assembly draw a logical and praiseworthy distinction between paying *due* reverence to the Cross and to Images, and the unprimitive additions in the way of worshipping it and them, declaring the opinions of the Early Fathers to be that quoted above in Latin, "that Images are not to be worshipped or adored, but are to be used for lengthy memorials of the originals." (See also S. Augustine on Images; see Note 2, Chapter VI.)

The Council likewise rejected the letter of Pope Adrian I. which protested against the Frankfort Council, rejecting also his quotations from the Fathers as irrelevant. The letter of Gregory II. on the same subject they condemned likewise, hesitating not to describe Image worship as a "pestilential superstition." In the following year Agobard, Bishop of Lyons, went much further, and, however powerful we may grant his treatise to have been ("Contra superstitionem eorum, qui picturis et imaginibus sanctorum adorationis obsequiem deferendum putant"), still we need not further refer to it. Claudius, appointed Bishop of Turin by Louis the Pious, found such an exaggerated veneration throughout his diocese, that he was forced, with much reluctance, to order them to be destroyed and cast forth from the Church.

The worship of Images was condemned also at the Council of Mayence, Worms, and at others, notably at Constance (1414-1418) and Basle (1431-1438).

We have therefore direct proof that for the space of about eight hundred years after Christ there was great diversity

of opinion on this subject in the East, while the clergy in convocation of the greatest Empire of those times unanimously rejected the undue worship of Images. Charles the Great may have had some Erastian ideas, but, as we have just said, it was in his reign that there came a flash of revival of learning, and his clergy were the most learned of the time.

In the East the Image controversy did not cease until the regency of "the orthodox Theodora," who restored Images in 842, as already stated.

But in the reign of Alexius I., Comnenus, Emperor of the Eastern Empire (b. 1048, d. 1118), a dispute as to Images arose, the Emperor having applied to exigencies of the State some of the figures which adorned the Churches. Leo, Bishop of Chalcedon, protested against the action of Alexius, alleging that the Images were endued with some portion of inherent sanctity. At a Council held in Constantinople it was decided that Images should have a *relative* worship only—*σχετικῶς προσκυνοῦμεν οὐ λατρευτικῶς τὰς εἰκόνας* (see Mosheim, Chap. XI.). Evidently Image "worship" was neither taught from the beginning, nor received everywhere by all people in the same sense.

Moreover Gregory the Great (Pope in 590, died in 604), said: "Regia potestas cœlitus est Imperator super omnes homines data" (Ep. 2), and "Ab imaginum adoratione prohibeat, et zelum eorum laudet qui nihil manufacturum adorare volunt" (Ep. 7), and also "On no account forbid images and pictures to be made and exhibited in Churches; they are the books of the unlearned (ad instruendas solummodo mentes nescientium), but by all and every means forbid any worship or adoration to be paid to them."

The English Catholic Church steers again that middle

course which is nearest to truth, so escaping the Scylla and Charybdis of extremes, in fact follows practically the Caroline Books, the Gallican Councils, and the words of Gregory the Great.

We do not deny that great and good men, *e.g.*, S. John Damascene (the ancestor of the Schoolmen, see Robertson's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. III., p. 47, etc., and p. 302), have advocated undue veneration of Images, but they arrived upon the scene comparatively late, and do not prove a general consensus of opinion among the Early Fathers, among Councils, or among Roman Patriarchs.

To those who draw their arguments against *all* uses of Images or sculptured Figures in Churches from the fact that Images were not used at a very early period, we desire to point out that it required time for Christian art to arise and be developed, that there existed among so many early Christians a tendency to depreciate the human figure and to deny its beauty, inasmuch as Christianity had shown the inestimable value of the soul and spirit of a baptized person, apparently forgetting that in His Own Person our Lord had taught them that the human body could, by the Water of Regeneration, be made temples of the Holy Ghost, and that the time shall come when the body shall be raised spiritual and incorruptible, when no longer shall the present imperfections of the body exist to cause us shame, for what now evokes this feeling is the *knowledge of our corporeal imperfections*, what causes us this shame is not nakedness, but the fact that it means an exposition of fallen nature. So even in profane sculpture there need not necessarily be either indecency or shame.

Perhaps, too, a certain portion or influence of the Schools of Alexandria may also have helped to produce this con-

tempt of the body owing to the evil influence which was attributed to "*matter*"; Plotinus is very emphatic on this point, as when he said: "Matter is the principle of individuation, and he who would seek the One must have nothing to do with the things of matter."

In the present day an objection to statuary (such as the Apollo Belvidere or some of Thorwalsden's beautiful conceptions) is generally the mark of an ignorant, vulgar, unrefined mind, or indeed frequently of the total absence of any mind in the highest sense.

Also Images would not be used in certain localities because of surroundings, idolatrous nations or communities. Circumstances alter cases, and the still lingering cult of heathenism in the early ages of the Church was sufficient reason for the abstention from representing the human figure in Christian art.

Part of Gregory's Thirteenth Epistle puts the matter into a nut shell: "... it has been reported to us that, inflamed with indiscreet zeal, you have broken some Images of the Saints on the ground that they ought not to be worshipped; and, verily, we praised you for having forbidden that they should be worshipped, we blamed you for having broken them. Say, brother, by what Priest did we ever hear that that was done which you have done. ... For to adore a picture is one thing, to learn by means of a picture what ought to be adored is another. For that which writing effects upon people who can read the same effect does a picture produce upon the unlearned who behold it. ... This point ought to have been especially attended to by you who lived amid the heathen, lest, when inflamed incautiously by a righteous zeal, you should cause a stumbling-block in savage minds. Therefore, that which

was placed in the Church, not to be adored but only to instruct the minds of the ignorant, that should not be broken, and, because antiquity has with good reason permitted the history of the Saints to be painted in venerable places, if you had seasoned your zeal with discretion without doubt you would have been able to obtain what you desired with benefit, and not have scattered the flock which was folded, but rather have collected that which was scattered. . . . You must call together the dispersed sons of the Church, and show them by proofs of Holy Scripture that it is unlawful that any thing made with hands should be worshipped, because it is written: 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.' And you must then add that the paintings of Images were formed for the edification of the unlearned, that, being ignorant of letters, they might, by seeing the story, learn what has been done, and that because you saw that it passed into worship you were moved to order the Images to be broken.

"And say to them: 'If you desire to have Images in Church for the sake of that instruction for which they were originally made, by all means do I permit them to be made and possessed.' And tell them that what displeased you was not the mere sight of the history but that worship which was unlawfully paid to the Images. . . . And if any one desire to make Images, do not forbid them by any means, but forbid Images to be worshipped by every means. But, my brother, anxiously admonish them that from the sight of the historical subject they cherish a warmth of compunction, and prostrate themselves humbly in the worship of the Omnipotent Trinity alone."

Dr. Pusey thus sums up with respect to Images and their use in the Early Church: "(1) In the three first centuries

it is positively stated that the Christians had no Images. (2) Private individuals had pictures, but the custom was discouraged (Aug.). (3) The Cross, not the Crucifix, was used; the first mention of the Cross in a Church is in the time of Constantine. (4) The first mention of pictures (except to forbid them) is at the end of the fourth century, and these historical pictures from the Old Testament or of martyrdoms, not of individuals" (? of solitary individuals not forming part of a scene). "(5) No account of any picture of our Lord being publicly used in the first six centuries; the first is in Leontius (Apol. pro Christian., A.D. 600). (6) Outward reverence is condemned." ("And this as late as Gregory M., who speaks in his genuine works very decisively against outward reverence to Images, the passage apologizing for it being spurious.")

Having noted the divergent, nay, even contrary, opinions of Councils as to the use of Images, let us now consider from authoritative works of the Roman Church what idea can be, or ought to be, held in that Communion.

It is true that the Council of Trent said in Session 25, 3rd and 4th of December, 1563: "Moreover, the Images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other Saints, are most specially *to be had and retained* in Churches" ("habendas et retinendas"), "and due honour and veneration must be rendered to them, not because any divinity is believed to be in them, or virtue for which they are to be worshipped; or because anything is to be asked from them; or because trust is to be placed in them, *as formerly was done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols;* but because the honour shown to them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; so that by the Images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our head and fall prostrate, we

adore Christ, and venerate the Saints whose likenesses they bear—the same thing which is sanctioned by the Decrees of Councils, especially of the Second Nicene Council against the oppugners of Images."

The Latin words "habendas et retinendas" imply, at least, *must*, or *ought* to, be had and retained. And the following caution was added:—

"That all disgraceful gains be banished.

"That all lascivious wantonness in the forms and ornaments of the Images be forbidden.

"That men do not abuse the celebrations of the Saints, and the visiting of their relics, for purposes of revellings and drunkenness, as though the feast days in honour of the Saints were to be passed in luxury and lasciviousness.

"That no unwonted Image be admitted into any Church without the permission of the Bishop, nor without the same consent any new miracles allowed, or any new relics to be received."

But the Catechism of the Council of Trent is differently worded.

Although Buckley's translation has for a heading, "The Saints, and also Christ, ought to be pictured and honoured," the original Latin (in the Leroux edition of 1848) does not express obligation, but "Usus imaginum Christi et sanctorum approbatur." "At vero cum Christus Dominus, ejusque sanctissima et purissima Mater, cæterique omnes sancti . . . eorum imagines pingi atque honorari, non modo hoc præcepto interdictum non fuit, sed etiam sanctum et grati animi certissimum argumentum semper habitum est. . . . Non solum autem licere in ecclesia imagines habere et illis honorem et cultum adhibere, ostendet parochus, cum honos qui eis exhibetur, referatur at prototypa," etc. Which Buckley

translates: "But to depict and honour the Images of Christ our Lord, of His most holy and pure Mother, and of all the other Saints . . . is not only not forbidden by this (Second) Commandment, but has always been esteemed a holy practice, and a most certain indication of a grateful mind. . . . But the Pastor will not content himself with merely showing the lawfulness of the use of Images in Churches, and of paying them honour and respect, since this honour and respect are referred to their prototypes," etc.

While the Council's Decree says that Images *must be* used, the Catechism which is for a guide to the clergy when they teach, contents itself with stating that the use of Images is a lawful and holy practice, useful in teaching Church history to the ignorant, and to set holy men of old before our eyes in order that we may be admonished by their good examples.

From the frequent occasions in which an objectionable adoration of Images is mentioned as having occurred and been rebuked by holy men of old—some of whom we have quoted—it is evident that people did often, if not generally, lack capacity to discern between the scholastic distinctions of doulia, hyperdoulia, latria. When one has noticed and examined the remnants of nature worship (emblems made of red coral, etc.), which even in the present time are noticeable as existing among certain people of Southern Italy, and calls to mind the many instances when an easily-excited and very credulous temperament has accepted the wildest statements and "miracles," it need cause no surprise that so many are led to wander far beyond the original intention of the use of Pictures and Images, and do actually worship them unduly.

We hope that when we use the words "worship unduly,"

we shall not be accused of granting that anything made by man should be worshipped in the sense in which we generally, almost always, use the word, but we employ the word "unduly," in connection with "worship," because of the various ways in which the latter word may be correctly used, and has been used.

We need not feel surprised that Italian sailors in a storm, finding that prayers offered and lighted candles vowed to their Patron Saint Martin, fail to induce him to assuage the elements, proceed to beat the Saint's Image with ropes' ends, and also that English seamen, struck by the mingled irreverence and absurdity, should, by a distortion of the beautiful Italian language, have added an odd phrase to vulgar English.

It may be urged, as indeed it often is, that distortions of proper Invocation and reverence are but examples of that exaggeration of details so natural to the religion of the vulgar. We must therefore examine some of the statements of Romish writers, whose Ultramontane orthodoxy is asserted by the Roman Church, especially of those who have been placed on the roll of canonized Saints or of Professors in Theology.

Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1621) mentions three opinions current in his time in the Roman Church :—

1. To worship *before* the Image but not the Image itself. But this is meat not strong enough for the Cardinal. He speaks with more affection of the second view.

2. That the Image should be worshipped with either *superior worship Latria*, or with the *inferior-greater* worship, namely, *Hyperdoulia*, or else with the *least honourable doulia*.

3. The third opinion is that Images are to be worshipped *in themselves*, but with the *inferior* worship only.

Moreover, he hesitates not to tell us—in the twenty-first chapter of his work, "Concerning Images"—that "Imagines Christi et Sanctorum venerandæ sunt, non solum per accidens vel improprie, sed etiam *per se*, et proprie, ita ut ipsæ terminent venerationem, ut in se considerantur, et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris." "The Images of Christ and of the Saints are to be venerated, not only by accident, and improperly, but absolutely and by themselves, so that they themselves are the end of the veneration," *i.e.*, not only as representatives of our Lord, or of the Saints, but in themselves as Images.

Here we are told the worship terminates with the Image, but, when a Romish person is taxed with his Church approving of such, he maintains that the worship or veneration is carried on to that Saint represented by the Image.

Of course a non-natural sense can be given to these and similar words, depriving them of what we consider objectionable; "words, mere words."

But the words of a good man, a canonized Saint, speak further on this subject, and clinch the matter, namely, of S. Bonaventura.* Now, although a Council of Bishops sits in order to investigate the claims to canonization, we are told on good authority that the Pope of Rome is infallible in the Act of Canonization. We might assume that the exposition of a point of doctrine by a canonized Saint would

*John Fidanza, universally known as Bonaventura, was the most famous pupil of the English Franciscan Alexander of Hales, the "Doctor irrefragibilis." Born near Florence in A.D. 1221, he became general of his Order in 1257, Cardinal and Archbishop of Ostia in 1273 (under Gregory X.), died in 1274. He was inclined to Mysticism, like Richard of S. Victor, his angelic purity made him very lovable, and he is known as the "Doctor seraphicus," a beautiful and appropriate title. He was canonized in 1482. In 1558 Sixtus V. edited his works in eight volumes, who said that Bonaventura wrote of divine matters in such a manner that the Holy Ghost seems to have spoken to him.

be absolutely true and reliable under such conditions. But having more than once spoken on the subject of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, when we have quoted a certain passage from S. Thomas Aquinas, which is dead against this latest dogma (but one) of the Roman Church, the answer has been made to us: "Yes, but S. Thomas Aquinas wrote those words as a private person, as a doctor, therefore he might err, and he did err." Roman Popes have likewise spoken, so we are told, on many occasions as private doctors; it is a convenient principle, but somewhat confusing.

Which reminds us that in 726, one of Pope Gregory's successors, Pope Gregory II., held a Council at Rome, in which he anathematized those who objected to, or did not worship, sacred Images. The Roman Catholic controversialist, Dr. Milner, says, that Roman doctors and divines agree that Images are to be reckoned among things indifferent. He also quotes: "The learned Petavius says, 'We must lay it down as a principle that Images are to be reckoned among things *adiaphora* (indifferent).'"

S. Bonaventura writes: "Should the worship of *latria* be given to the Image of Christ? A man speaks to the Image in his prayers, therefore he speaks to the Image as a reasoning creature, therefore *he speaks to the Image as to Christ*, and just as he speaks just so does he worship and adore, therefore *he ought to adore the Image of Christ.*"

It strikes us that there may have been more intended than lies on the surface of the Council's words in its Decree, when we call to mind the words of that shining light of the Tridentine Assembly, Naclantius, Bishop of Clugium, whose expressions are direct enough: "Since the one thing is not separated from the other (for the original Being is altogether

a different thing from the Image, yet since it shines forth in the Image, yet is not severed from it), so neither is the worship or adoration of the two divided, but the worship or adoration of both is one and the same."

And he continues further: "Wherefore, not only must it be confessed that the faithful in the Church do adore before the Image (as some perhaps for caution's sake express themselves), but also, it must be confessed that they do worship the Image without any manner of scruple which you could suggest; nay, moreover, they venerate the Image with that worship with which they venerate the original."

"For caution's sake!" We thank thee for that word! It helps to explain the diluted forms of instruction which are so commonly in use for the feeding of Anglo-Romans and Romish perverts.

Some years ago we entered that glorious pile of Chartres. We gazed upwards, both before going in and after we had gone out, upon the two spires, each of different styles, but each beautiful: the newer, or N.W., the most lovely in France. We looked with awe upon the hoary interior of the West Front; the sight of the rich and gorgeous glass lifted our minds upwards in thought to the Temple not made with hands; we felt the influence of the extraordinary crypt stretching Eastwards, and noted on the walls the painted representations of the three daughters which make up the Catholic family: the fanes of Rome, Constantinople, and of Canterbury (the throne "papa alterius orbis"), and we prayed for visible union. But we also saw the well-known "black Virgin" of Chartres, with its metal hearts as ornaments, and the thought struck us, Must this figure, a reproduction of that burnt in the Revolution, must this sable Image be worshipped with hyperdoulia as should be

the Virgin, or with latria as representing the Blessed Virgin who had personal contact with our Lord? Ought this Image to be worshipped with a worship which ends in itself?

But we would speak of another Image which should be worshipped with latria, if authoritative Romish teaching be a guide. We speak of "Il Bambino," or "The Child," a doll-like figure intended to represent our Lord in His Infancy; the Image is, say, about two feet long. In a work, whose title we translate "Historical Notices of the Miraculous Image of the Jesus which is venerated in the venerable Presbyterial Church of the Holy Mary in the Ara Cœli at Rome, with some Devotional Exercises to obtain the Graces which are prayed for," we read that it is to be adored (ad adorarlo). In this interesting account we read that, when made, the Image could not be fully painted because the artificer, a monk at Jerusalem, lacked colour. After many prayers and much fasting, he awoke one morning, and lo! he found that there was no need of paint, for during the night the Image had received the necessary flesh colour. Its fame went abroad; people trouped in that they might worship the Image (ad adorarlo divotimento). Heathen people were converted by the sight of this miraculous Bambino. The Image, being brought to Rome, was accompanied by miracles: the ship which was conveying it having been wrecked, the Bambino arrived of its own accord at Leghorn.

Having been placed in a special richly decorated carriage, with clergy to escort it, the Image is carried to sick folk, the people kneel in the street; what the fee may be we know not. The little Image imparts many graces to those who are devout. One day a lady, from absolute veneration, took away the Bambino to her own house, but, after a few

days, it miraculously returned to Ara Cœli, ringing all the bells of the Church and the convent, as if it were a festival, without anyone else having touched them. All the monks ran to see what had caused this prodigy, and, to their intense astonishment, they saw the Image of the Holy Infant back again, standing on the Altar. On account of such so many and great miracles the wonder-working Figure is worshipped.

The women of the poorer class are of the opinion that if the Bambino be placed at the foot of the bed it will cause a safe delivery; it performs the part of a more recent Lucinda.

But more! This Image is actually lifted up to *bless* the congregation!

All persons fall prostrate, people could do no more if it were the Blessed Sacrament, the Very Body, of our Blessed Lord Itself; they could hardly do less when the "ambassador of Christ" gives the Blessing in the Name of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, his right hand raised in blessing while the left rests on the Altar of the Christian Sacrifice. This function is entitled, "The Benediction of the Bambino." The thought strikes us that it wears very much the appearance of being a parody of the "Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament."

Such wonderful things, therefore, do the Ara Cœlians!

And this Image must be adored, worshipped with latria, with the highest possible quality of worship, as should be the Presence in the Sacred Mysteries of the Altar; as should be worshipped the Holy Three, because it must be worshipped with the same supreme worship as the Saviour Whom it represents, and itself is "the end of the worship."

It was Blaise Paschal, if we remember rightly, who said, "continuous beauty wearies"; but no flagging of strength,

either of mind or body, need be feared on this ground. Having to please the religious feelings of the ignorant, the most gaudy, tawdry, doll-like figures are erected; we have seen in Spain holy families and Saints in the stiff costumes of Philip V.

Of the glorious sign of Christianity, the Cross, as to the quality of veneration or of worship due to it, much has been written.

We think we are not in error when we say that Peter Lombard (d. circ. 1160), and S. Thomas Aquinas (c. 1227-1274), expressed opposite opinions on this subject; the former saying that the Cross should not be worshipped with latria, the latter (canonized by Pope John XXII. in 1325) drawing out the formal syllogism: "The Cross is the Image of Christ Crucified, but the Image of Christ is to be adored with worship supreme and divine, therefore must the Cross on which He suffered be likewise adored in the same manner. If regarded as an Image of the Crucified Lord, it must be worshipped with latria, or, if regarded as something sacred to Christ, it should be worshipped with hyperdoulia"—we think that we have stated elsewhere that this hyperdoulia is an extent of worship due to the Blessed Virgin only—but that all other Crosses being Images of Christ are to be adored with supreme divine worship. "Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione latriæ consequens est quod ejus imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda" ("Summ." P. III., Qu. 25, Art. 3).

Is this the "*due* worship" intended by the wording of the Council of Trent? In Southern Europe, as we know full well, the people understand or know nothing of the scholastic hyper-distinction between the Cross "as an Image of the Crucified," and the Cross "as something appertaining to

Christ"; indeed neither in South America nor in any part of Europe is it possible for people to be able to recognize such differences. If, regarding the Cross in the latter view, they worship it with latria, do they go beyond the bounds of "due worship," do they commit idolatry?

We venture to think that such worship is contrary to the Decrees of Trent. "Concerning Images, that those of Christ, of the Virgin, and of Saints, ought to be kept in the Churches, and to have due honour given them; not that there is any divinity or virtue in them, but because the honour redoundeth to the thing represented, Christ and the Saints being worshipped through the Images, the similitudes of Christ and of the Saints; as hath been defined by the Councils, especially in the Second of Nice. That for histories, the mysteries of religion, expressed in pictures, are taught to the people, and the Articles of Faith called to their mind; and not only the Benefits of Christ are suggested to them, but the miracles and examples of Saints are even put before their eyes, that they may thank God for them, and imitate them; anathematizing those that teach or believe the contrary" (Father Paul Sarpi, Book VIII.—very slightly altered from Brent's translation).

Barring the anathematizing, we can see nothing to object to in the above quotation; we believe that Saints have performed miracles, though we cannot accept as genuine and authentic all the miracles of Saints alleged to be so by the Roman Church, neither can we accept as Saints all those called so by that Church. The principle here followed seems to us to be that of Gregory, and not opposed to that part of Henry VIII.'s "Injunctions" of 1538 about Images being the books of the unlearned.

The writer can bear witness to the practicability and use

of the principle, as he himself has often conducted miners and other manual-labour men through two of our most beautiful Cathedrals, and he was frequently struck by the fact that a painted window, or a sculptured figure, helped the progress of explanation, while the sight-seers themselves seemed always interested, impressed, and reverent. After all, is not this merely a sort of "kindergarten" system, in which the sense of sight, in combination with intelligence of brain, is made to minister to an increased perception of God and of His creation?

"Afterwards it" (*i.e.*, the Tridentine Council) "added, that, desiring to take away the abuses and occasions of pernicious errors, it doth ordain that, if there be cause to make an Image of the Deity, to declare the historical pictures of the Holy Scriptures, the people be taught that it is not done because it can be seen with bodily eyes; that all superstition in Invocation of Saints, worship of Relics, and use of Images be taken away; that all dishonest gain be abolished, all excess avoided, Images not pictured nor adorned lasciviously, nor banquets made in the Feasts of the Saints, or visitation of Relics; that no unusual Image be put in any Church or other place, but approved by the Bishop; that no new miracles be admitted, or new Relics received, and in case of any doubt or abuse hard to be removed, or great difficulty, the Bishop shall expect the opinion of the Provincial Council, neither shall anything new, or unusual, in the Church be decreed without the consent of his Holiness."

Would that the rulers of the Roman Church and her clergy did really act upon these words! "Superstition in Invocation of Saints, worship of Relics and Images," still continues; in certain cases it has actually increased.

S. Bonaventura wrote: "The selfsame worship and adoration which Christians are bound to pay to Christ the Lord, the same they are equally bound to pay to His Image, *and to the representation of His Cross.*" Also S. Francis de Sales *—in "Tractu Apologiæ de Vexillo Crucis præfixo"—writes: "In so far as the Cross represents Christ Crucified, and has been sprinkled with His Blood, it is to be adored with the same adoration as Christ Himself is adored, that is, with latria."

In short; the Cross, when regarded "as something sacred to Christ," is to be adored with the same quality of worship as that which at present the Romish people offer to the Blessed Virgin herself; if the Cross be not regarded under the other aspect, it is to be worshipped with that supreme adoration which we consider to be the special prerogative of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Moreover, this does not refer to worshipping the actual Cross on Calvary, which was stained with the Most Precious Life-giving Blood of our Lord, but only to representations of the true Cross in Churches, by the roadside, or in private houses.

But, in speaking of the alleged discovery of the true Cross by S. Helena in c. 326, S. Ambrose says: "She therefore found the title; she adored the King—not in truth the wood, for this is a heathen error and a vain thing of the ungodly—but she adored Him Who had hung upon the wood, and Who was called by the title"—*i.e.*, the title on the Cross. Some, however, regard the oration on the death of Theodosius—from which this is quoted—as a forgery.

* S. Francis de Sales, born 1567: Bishop of Geneva, died 1622, canonized 1665. Author of a valuable work, "Introduction a la Vie Devote," published by him in 1608.

Another alleged reason for worshipping with latria the Cross, the spear, the nails, the winding sheet, etc., is that our Lord's Sacred Person touched them—leaving out for the present the fact that many, or most, of these "Relics" are absolute frauds (see next Chapter)—His Blood dropped upon them. This being so, S. Thomas Aquinas says, that if, under one aspect, the Blessed Virgin should be worshipped with hyperdoulia, so, under another aspect, she should be *worshipped with latria*, for if it be considered right and proper that the Cross, etc. should be worshipped with latria, because of contact with our Lord, not less so, but how much more, should the Blessed Virgin herself receive divine worship, who bore Him, and ministered to Him through His Childhood; it must be therefore that she should be worshipped with the same veneration and adoration as that with which Christ God is worshipped.

The consequences of such principles may open an endless vista of contingent possibilities and of eventual evolutions.

Of the Romish service of worshipping the Cross we do not now speak much. The Rubric of the Pontificale Romanus (Rome, 1595) reads that "*Supreme worship* is due to the Cross." It is evident that a new Cross set up in a Church is as much to be worshipped with latria as would anything, say a piece of the True Cross, which had professedly been tinged by our Lord's Blood.

Either the Council's moderate language would mean that such proceedings and principles exceed its intentions, or else that formulated language can be made to mean almost anything that may become convenient or fashionable, and the worship due to the Trinity can likewise be given to certain representative lifeless figures and objects.

Are we to take it as a fact that at the Council there was

no intention to cultivate definiteness in such matters because of the ocean of superstition and forgeries, which was too deep to be sounded and surveyed; that there lacked authority, so boasted of, to produce a genuine, much-longed-for reformation, even with a supposed infallible Council, and the Ultramontane assertion that an infallible Pope was reigning in Italy? If we are to believe Scipio Henricus, "Pontifex monuit legatos ut in concilio nihil staturent quod controversum inter Catholicos." And the Roman Catholic Courayer notes: "Comme on avait beaucoup de differents sentiments à menager, l'attention du concile fut toujours de choisir tellement ses expressions qu'elles pussent également satisfaire les personnes de sentiments opposés. C'est ce qui rend quelquefois le sens du Concile si equivoque, que chaque parti trouvait que la décision lui etait favorable, comme on le vit dans les disputes de la justification et de l'intention."

But there are Images which the Roman Church—her rulers, that is to say—permit to be accepted as "miraculous" Crucifixes. One which bowed the head to Pius V., another which did the same, but to avoid the destructive impact of a cannon ball. There are, or were, three at Naples; another wrought by S. Luke, and carried by the angels to Loretto. We believe that at the Chapel of the Beguines, at Gand, one used to exist which, having opened its mouth to console a nun, was unable to shut it again; one at Trent, which nodded its head to express its approval of the Decrees of the Council. These are but few out of many.

We think that perhaps it would be well to point out that bowing to, or kissing the Cross, is not necessarily an action which proves that the person so doing is giving either undue honour or "worship" as commonly understood.

The Easterns cense the Icons on the side of the Iconstasis

next to the Nave, but they never pay either doulia or hyperdoulia to them, neither does the work of any Eastern divine of authority advocate more than due reverence, yet the people kiss the Icons, in reverence only.

The following is quoted from "Six Months in a Syrian Monastery," by Oswald H. Parry, B.A. (1895): "In the East wall of the centre Sanctuary is the 'Treasury of the Cross,' a hole in the wall containing the great Silver Cross that is brought out only on Good Friday. Then all the people come and bow before it, and offer a special prayer to the Redeemer. The reverence paid to the Cross by all good Syrians is very noticeable. It is not of the nature of worship, in spite of the extravagant language with which it is at times addressed. For such language, it is almost a commonplace to say, has a very different meaning when employed by the self-restrained piety of the West, or the less temperate enthusiasm of the East. As in the earlier days of Christianity, so now in a Moslem country, the sign of the Cross is considered to have a special significance, and, by the more ignorant, a certain " (sure ?) " efficacy, and is used on every possible occasion. During the Daily Services the worshippers continually kiss the Cross wherever it hangs painted on the walls or worked upon the hangings. So the people sign themselves more than once during the Liturgy in the name of the Holy Trinity, and make the sign over every meal of which they partake."

The Syrians do not care for pictures, and those in use among them have been introduced through the Papal party, or from Russia.

We are not Protestants by religion, but Catholics, holding the "via media" between exaggerations of extremes. We do not look upon the Cross as a "Papistical idol"; we, like

S. Paul, exclaim, "Far be it from me to glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me and I unto the world" (Gal. vi. 14).

On the gables of our Churches, on the tapering summits of our spires, the sign of the Faith strikes our upward glance. Raising above the great ball its golden Cross glittering in the sunshine—symbolic of how the sign shall yet rule the earth—rearing it above the rush of necessary worldly business, above the fogs—(so it is said) of earth's mightiest metropolis, the Cathedral of S. Paul sends forth its message, visible in its embodiment, to those who labour on the teeming river, to the hurrying crowds of Lothbury and the Stock Exchange, preaching, "God so loved the world." The ground plan of most of our largest Churches ever preaches to the thoughtful Christian that the message of the Cross must go forth to the four corners of the world, from which in His own good time, at the sign of the Cross in the heavens (S. Matt. xxiv. 30), shall the countless multitudes that no man can number assemble at the Marriage Feast of the Lamb, when His Bride, the Universal Church—now militant and expectant—cleansed for ever from every spot and wrinkle of human infirmity, shall reign triumphant for ever.

"Those who believe that the Holy Cross has been indeed the instrument of our salvation, cannot but consider it as the natural symbol of Christian love; and if they reject a most natural and holy sign for fear of idolatry, they seem to be almost as inconsistent as a man who should condemn himself to voluntary dumbness for fear of idle words" ("Russia and the English Church," p. 5).

And what as to the teaching and permission of our own Catholic and Apostolic Daughter of the venerable Mother

of Jerusalem, the true Mother and Mistress of the many Catholic Altars throughout the world?

Comparatively few who talk so loosely and so censoriously about Crosses and Crucifixes in Churches as being marks of "superstition and idolatry"; few such Protestants are aware that that body which holds the most faithfully to the tenets and practices of the original (and in this sense orthodox) Protestants erect in their places of worship the Figure of Christ and Him crucified.

If we had not previously read the subject we should indeed have felt very surprised when, having entered for the first time a Lutheran place of worship in North Germany, we beheld at the East end a Table of white stone or marble, upon which were placed two immense candlesticks with lighted candles (it was about 11 o'clock in the morning), and between them an immense Crucifix; against the East wall stood large Images of the four Evangelists.

Between 1559-60, Bishop Grindal, in writing to Peter Martyr, asked him "to use his interest with the Queen" (Elizabeth); "and to write a letter to dissuade her against setting up, or continuing the Crucifix. But Martyr excused himself . . . especially seeing, as it was said, the English were now consulting about embracing the *Augustan* Confession, and of entering into league with the *German Protestants who all had the Crucifix in their Churches*" (Strype's "Grindal").

In his work, "Sketches of Continental Ecclesiology," the Rev. Benjamin Webb writes thus concerning what he saw in the Church of Saint Sebaldus, in Nuremburg, about 1847: "The most remarkable thing with respect to the whole Church is the Catholic aspect still preserved by its Lutheran holders. Scarcely one feature has been disturbed. The

choir retains its double stalls, its Altar—vested in purple with four candlesticks, with a poor reredos, but exquisite rood with S. Mary and S. John—and the bronze shrine of S. Sebaldus. The whole Church is studded with Altars, still vested and fitted with lights; and on a North Altar near the empty tabernacle a lamp still burns continually. I chanced to reach Nuremburg on the Feast of S. Sebaldus. The Church was crowded, every Altar lighted, and the shrine and Altars garlanded with flowers." Mr. Webb observes, "It was a very singular exhibition of Protestantism." He does not by these words mean that such decorations are unfit for the House of God, but that the sight of all this would astonish the English Protestant accustomed to those peculiar ideas which he considers to be so intimately connected with "the sincere milk of the word"; to such an one the likings and practices of these German Protestants should be considered as savouring too much of "Popish mummeries"; but the German loves art, the English Puritan generally fails to see, certainly cannot appreciate it. The English Protestant is not a faithful follower of Luther, of original Protestantism; the monk thoroughly believed in the Real Presence of our Lord's Body in the Holy Eucharist—even though by "Consubstantiation"—but the modern British Protestant denies that any such Objective Presence exists.

We ourselves visited the Church of Saint Laurence, Nuremburg, in June, 1896, and counted in that interesting building eleven Altars or Tables, and on every one were placed a pair of candlesticks, with candles in them, and a *Crucifix;* and this building has been in possession of the Protestants for many years.

In Sir Robert Phillimore's "Ecclesiastical Judgments"

(on p. 380) we read: "In Denmark, where the Evangelical Lutheran Church is established as the Church of the State, there is the Vor Vrue Kirche, our Lady's Church, the principal Church in Copenhagen. In the Pediment is sculptured a group of S. John preaching in the wilderness; in the Vestibule a frieze, in which is represented the entry into Jerusalem; in the Nave the twelve Apostles; over the Altar our Lord is sculptured, and in the Chancel the Baptismal Angel, and there are various *bassi relievi* of Scriptural subjects.

"There was a solemn inauguration of these figures—the glory of Thorwalsden's genius—in the Church in 1839."

The late Mr. Beresford Hope, in his temperate work "Worship in the Church of England," tells us that a picture in "The Graphic" of September 19th shows such a scene; also, in "The Guardian" for September 9th, 1874, is an account of a service in a Lutheran Protestant place of worship: "The Communion Table was covered with a white cloth, on it were a book and two tall candlesticks with lighted candles. Raised considerably above the Table *stood a Crucifix*. The Table was surrounded with flowers and evergreens."

We would add a further reference by inviting the reader to look out a picture in "The Illustrated News" for November 5th, 1892, representing the Christening of Princess Victoria Louisa, daughter of the Emperor of Germany. Underneath a red velvet canopy on a table stand two very large candlesticks, between them a Crucifix. In the same paper, in the issue of November 12th in the same year, is a picture of the "*Consecration*" (!) of the restored Schloss-Kirche, Wittenberg, *by the German Emperor*—this quality of the ceremonial is manifestly absurd—which scene was, we read, "a source of great interest to Protestant Germany." In this Chapel is the tomb of Luther. The bronze doors

contain the Figure of Christ, also statues of Luther, Melancthon, and of the Electors Frederick and John of Saxony. Over "the Altar of white stone," on the wall at the back of the so-called Altar, is a large *sculptured Crucifix*. In another part of the building is to be seen a Crucifix, a kneeling figure on each side; judging from this picture, it appears that this latter Crucifix is painted. Such Images, then, have the Lutheran Protestants. "When imagination is busy you know how the very earliest Christians, those close on the Apostles' times, used the sign of the Cross" (Dr. Pusey).

"Strange it is that, while not the Lutheran only, but the united Lutheran and Reformed bodies in Prussia, have the Crucifix upon their Communion Table, the very name of a Crucifix amongst us awakens only thoughts of idolatrous worship. There can in principle be no difference between the Crucifixion and the Figure of Christ Crucified; both alike set before our eyes Christ Crucified. The picture ordinarily by aid of colour sets forth His Sacred Form and Countenance, and the Eyes, which seem almost to look on those who look on Him, more vividly to the mind. Yet pictures of the Crucifixion are received and beheld by all with reverence and love, the Crucifix with dread of some wrong design in" (p. 146).

"I could not, when asked, but say (as Dr. Arnold said) that the Crucifix in itself was not forbidden by the Second Commandment, for the Second Commandment forbids us to make to ourselves any likenesses of the Invisible God; the Crucifix represents not the Son in His Invisible Deity, but in 'the Form of a Servant,' which He took for us, and in which 'He became obedient unto death,' and that the death of the Cross (p. 146). . . . I need not say to your

Lordship that not Images, but the *worship* of Images, was forbidden either by the Council of Frankfort to which we appeal or by the English Church. The Article says expressly, 'worshipping and adoration as well of Images as of Relics'" (p. 147). (Dr. Pusey, "Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London," pub. John Henry Parker, 1851.)

The great Earl of Shaftesbury (d. 1885), who described himself as an "Evangelical of the Evangelicals," bought a Crucifix at Padua, and wrote: "To bear about a memorial of what God Himself once exhibited to the world does but simply recall His Death and Passion, and forces us, as Scripture has foretold, 'to look on Him Whom we pierced'" (see "The Life and Work of Lord Shaftesbury," by Edwin Hodder, London, 1886).

We understand that the present condition of the law—whether Ecclesiastical or State law it matters not—forbids the erection of a Crucifix, *by itself*, on the top of the Screen. When we say "by itself" we mean without other figures, say of the Virgin and S. John the Divine. The presence of these two figures compose, with the Crucifix, a *scene*, the portrayal of an historic event, and the portrayal of a scene or event is lawful. There is ancient authority for this distinction between the erection of a single figure, and the use of more than one whereby a scene is expressed.

The writer did himself—with the consent and co-operation of the Churchwardens—erect a Chancel Screen, and made this Screen a "Rood Screen" by placing a Crucifix on the top of it. When the Lord Bishop saw this Screen he said that the erection of the Rood was illegal, being a single Figure: to construct a *scene*, the Images of the Virgin and S. John should be added. This addition was made, and the

scene of Calvary called to mind the words painted lower down on the Screen: "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

As a matter of æstheticism, we think that the Crucifix frequently looks better when by itself, as the fully-clothed Images of the Virgin and S. John may look heavy, unless painted. In the case of iron screens would the Image —and the Crucifix—be made of iron or of wood? Surely they should be of metal, but we should consider metal figures—most probably merely cast—as offensively opposed to good art. Metal Rood Screens in England are modernities.

Inasmuch as the entrance to the Sanctuary of the Temple not made with hands will be through the Blood of Christ alone, so it is on the Screen that we find the most appropriate position for the Rood, as the intending Communicants approaching the Throne of God upon earth—the Altar—would do so under the Crucifix, the Tree of Life whose Fruit can give Everlasting Life, even in this Valley of Humiliation.

Many of us can understand the mind and feeling of a certain Canon of Sarum who, when someone offered to give a Cross to be put on the Screen of his Church, declined, saying, that if he could not have at least as much as a Lutheran Minister he would have nothing placed there.

A few remarks on the subject of Images in Churches, in or since the time of Henry VIII., may be allowed. In the Ten Articles of 1536—"devised by the Kinge's highnes majesty to stablyshe Christen quietness amonge us," "approved by the consent and determination of the holy clergie"—No. VI. referred to the use of Images as being one of the laudable ceremonies used in the Church. In this Article, Images are spoken of as having been set up in

the Old Testament, and for the way in which their presence was abused they were destroyed. They can be erected in Churches, as "representers of virtue and good example . . . by occasion, the kindlers and stirrers of men's minds, and make men oft to remember and lament their sins and offences, especially the Image of Christ and our Lady . . . and that if people burn incense, or kneel before them, people must understand that such things are not unto the Saints or their Images, but only to God, and in His honour."

In 1538, by "Injunctions" of Henry VIII., Images which had been wrongfully used in an adoring manner by pilgrims were to be taken down; other Images were not included, at least so it seems; "offering of money, candles or tapers, to Images or Relics, and kissing or licking the same," are deprecated, as "tending to idolatry and superstition." Images which had been thus treated were to be pulled down, others were to be left standing, "as the books of unlearned men that cannot know letters."

Henry VIII., with all his enormities was, it should always be remembered, the most learned prince of his time, and—so we have read—had been brought up in theology, it having been intended that in due time he should be Archbishop of Canterbury.

Of other Images we need not speak at length, save only to say, that for a long time people had been deluded into the superstition that certain Images miraculously moved their eyes, nodded their heads, etc., whereas they were pulled by strings, wires, or springs; the devout were told that Images wept tears of blood, certain cavities in the head having been previously filled by the monks—induced so to act from the most pious intentions of course—with ducks'

blood, or some coloured liquid. Of such perhaps the best known was the "Rood of Boxley," near Maidstone, exposed to public view in 1538, when people for the first time saw how the eyes and mouth had been made to move by an arrangement of hairs. The people, having been taught that these movements were miraculous, proceeded to break the Image in pieces, amid much jeering. We remember having seen a magazine article in which an attempt was made to show that the people really knew that the Rood was moved by mechanism, and looked upon its vagaries as they would a miracle play. But the apology did not convince us. Still, the fact that people broke the Image does not really prove that they were exasperated by the deceit then first discovered. Certain lewd fellows of the baser sort can generally be found to work havoc, and to destroy other people's property, this occupation not being "work" but a pleasing excitement.

Bearing in mind that such exposures were followed by the burnings of Queen Mary, so unjustly called "Bloody," and later on by the vulgar excesses of the self-satisfied Independents, etc., and lastly, but not least, by the reigns of the ponderous Hanoverian Georges, Walpole, and the Whig-hatred of the Church; bearing all these influences in mind we ought to be able to make some allowance for much of the ignorance concerning history, and for that dislike of ceremonial we observe, a dislike if unreasonable still excusable; let us bear in mind these terrible hindrances, coupled with a procedure of might but not of justice, and with the addition of judgments of a Court whose uncanonical character of existence is equalled in absurdity only by some of its contradictory decisions.

The commissioners who, visiting dioceses under Queen

Elizabeth's "Injunctions," pulled down Roods and Images, did exceed their commission; the clergy were ordered not to "set forth or extol the dignity of any Images, Relics, or miracles." There were no orders (as in the "Injunctions" of Edward VI.) to destroy Images and Relics. It may be noted, as suggestive, that in an admonition attached to these "Injunctions" it was ordered that the Holy Table* should be placed Altarways in the Chancel, and that "for the giving the more reverence to the Holy Mysteries," the "common fine-bread," used for the Sacramental bread under Edward VI., was disallowed, and that the bread was to be "of the same fineness and round fashion, but somewhat bigger as was the usual bread or wafer, heretofore named singing cakes, which served for the use of the private Mass, plain, without any figure impressed upon it"; "after the manner of that used by the Papists," as the Puritan George Withers expressed it.

This hardly shows the spirit which would order the pulling down of all Images. In Queen Elizabeth's own Chapel were a Crucifix, Lights, and the Eucharistic Vestments. When Puritanism objected to those ornaments the Queen threatened to restore the Roods in all the Churches.

Of the Visitation in 1559 we read something in Strype's "Annals," wherein indeed are recounted the destruction of Roods and Images, but the ignorant multitudes seem to have been the executioners; we know that some were severely punished on account of these lawless deeds.

Collier, the historian, wrote:—

"To worship Images is pushing regard much too far: 'tis

*It may be necessary to inform some readers that the word, "Holy Table," is often used by the Greek Catholic Church for the "Altar," which Church has always clung determinedly to the doctrine of "The Real Presence" in the Eucharistic Service.

without doubt a criminal excess, unpractised and condemned by the Primitive Church; but then, on the other hand, to treat them coarsely and burn them looks like an affront to those they represent, and is altogether unbecoming Christians. To burn the figure of the Cross, and especially that of our Saviour, is, to speak softly, a horrid profanation: and, if we may reason from such indignities done to men, must be superlatively wicked. The reader, therefore, is to suppose that all this disorder was without commission, and nothing but mob-execution, for 'tis evident the practice of the Queen and Court was quite different, and therefore would give no countenance to such singular extremes" (E. H. Collier, Vol. II.)

Certain Images may have been taken down and destroyed quite legally; and not legally only, but something more, even reasonably. The following account of a gross and impertinent fraud gives us a clue to the removal of Images:—

"The Queen was the more disposed to give way to the removal of Images, upon the score of an imposturous practice lately discovered. At the arrival of the Earl of Sussex, the Queen's Lieutenant in Ireland, the Litany was sung in English at Christ Church, Dublin. Some bigoted Papists were much disturbed at this way of worship, and endeavoured to retrieve their old service by counterfeiting a miracle. To this purpose a marble figure of our Saviour, standing in the Cathedral, with a reed in His Hand and a crown of thorns on His Head, was observed to bleed through the thorns upon the Face of the Crucifix. This wonderful appearance happened in service time, when the Lord Lieutenant, the Archbishop, and the rest of the Privy Council were at Church. When this was perceived by the people they were strangely affected, especially when one privy to the contri-

vance told them that *our Saviour could not choose but sweat blood when heresy was come into the Church*. In short, all the audience being not of the same mind, the miracle occasioned a confusion, and the congregation broke up. Several of the people, however, stayed behind, fell on their knees, and prayed before the Image.

"The Archbishop of Dublin, suspecting some foul play, ordered the Sexton to wash and examine the Image. This being done, the man perceived a sponge soaked in blood within the hollow of the head. This sponge one Lee, formerly a monk of the Cathedral, had put within the head that Sunday morning, and being loaded with blood, 'twas strained through the cracks of the marble, and fell down in drops upon the face. The cheat being thus discovered, the Archbishop preached in the Church upon that subject the next Sunday. And to make the more serviceable impression, Lee, with his assistants, were planted upon a table before the pulpit, with their hands and legs tied, and their crime in paper upon their breast. In this equipage they appeared three Sundays, were imprisoned for some time, and afterwards banished the realm. A detail of this imposture was transmitted in a letter by Archbishop Curwin to Parker, elect of Canterbury. Parker brought it to the Queen, gave a turn to her inclination, and prevailed with her so far as to gain her consent for the removing Images out of Churches; however, all his learning and zeal could not persuade the Queen to part with the Crucifix and lighted tapers in her own closet: she thought, 'tis likely, that the arguing against the *use*, from the *abuse*, was short of exact reasoning" (Collier, Vol. II.)

But the Queen still kept the Crucifix and lighted tapers in her private Chapel!

"Another of his applications to the Queen about this time must not also be forgotten. The Queen had been prevailed with that Images, and lights, and Crucifixes should be enjoined to be taken away, to prevent that gross idolatry and superstition that the common people had been brought into by means thereof. But she retained, nevertheless, in her own private closet, a Crucifix and lighted tapers in Divine Service. This being so contrary to her own injunctions, and savouring so much of superstition, and that example being so dangerous, the Archbishop elect had the assurance and the honesty to advise Her Majesty not to permit these things any longer in her presence" ("Life of Parker").

Burnet tells us what inclination Elizabeth held with respect to Crosses and Images:—

"The Queen had been bred up from her infancy with a hatred of the Papacy, and a love to the Reformation. But yet, as her first impressions in her father's reign were in favour of such old rites as he had still retained; so in her own nature she loved state and magnificence, in religion, as well as in everything else; she thought that in her brother's reign they had stript it too much of external ornaments, and had made their doctrine too narrow in some points; therefore she intended to have some things explained in more general terms, that so all parties might be comprehended by them. She inclined to keep up Images in the Churches, and to have the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament left in some general words; that those who believed the Corporal Presence might not be driven away from the Church by too nice an explanation of it. Nor did she like the title of Supreme Head; she thought it imparted too great a power, and came too near that authority which

Christ only had over the Church" ("Burnet's Refor.," Vol. I., Part II., Book III., p. 562; Edition pub. by William S. Orr, 1850).

Into what an ignorant and piteous state must they have been brought at this period, when it was ordered that "the Tables of the Commandments may be comely set or hung up in the East end of the Chancel *to be read for edification*"—what very good and long sight the congregations must have enjoyed in those times!—"but also to give *some comely ornament*." A comely ornament! Often printed on paper; the grace and beauty of a common "poster"!

Sir Robert Phillimore ("Ecclesiastical Judgments"), brings forward an interesting suit, tried before the Court of Arches in 1684. The parishioners of Moulton, in Lincolnshire, wished to have pictures of the Apostles at the East end of their Church. A certain party objected to this setting up of Images, alleging that all such were forbidden by the Book of Homilies, more especially by the Homilies against the Peril of Idolatry, and also by the Injunctions of Edward VI. and Elizabeth. But the objector lost the suit, and had to pay cost. The sentence was signed by Sir Richard Lloyd, Dean of Arches; by Sir Thomas Exton, who succeeded him; by Dr. Pinfold, afterwards Advocate-General; it seems that this case of *Cook and others v.* Tallent was considered to be very important.

But Elizabeth, and our humble selves, are in agreement with such a well-known English Reformer as William Tindale, who translated the New Testament in 1527, and suffered at the stake in 1536. Tindale wrote, in his "An Answere unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, made by William Tindale": ". . . If I take a piece of the Cross of Christ, and make a little Cross thereof, and bear it about me, to look thereon

with a repenting heart at times when I am moved thereto, to put me in remembrance that the Body of Christ was broken, and His Blood shed thereon, for my sins; and believe steadfastly that the merciful truth of God shall forgive the sins of all that repent, for His death's sake, and never think on them more: then it serveth me, and I not it, and doth me the same service as if I read the Testament in a book, or as if the preacher preached it unto me. And in like manner, if I make a cross in my forehead, in a remembrance that God hath promised assistance unto all that believe in Him, for His sake that died on the Cross, then doth the Cross serve me, and I not it. And in like manner, if I bear on me, or look upon, a Cross, of whatsoever matter it be, or make a cross upon me, in remembrance that whosoever will be Christ's disciple must suffer a cross of adversity, tribulations, and persecution, so doth the Cross serve me, and I not it. And this was the use of the Cross once; and for this cause it was, at the beginning, set up in the Churches.

"And so, if I make an Image of Christ, or of anything that Christ hath done for me in a *memory* [from the Latin word *memoria*, which had been used by Latin Fathers for a Shrine, or small Chapel], it is good, and not evil, until it be abused. And even so, if I take the true life of a Saint, and cause it to be painted or carved, to put me in remembrance of the Saint's life, to follow the Saint as the Saint did Christ; and to put me in remembrance of the great faith of the Saint to God, and how true God was to help him out of all tribulation; and to see the Saint's love towards his neighbour, in that he so patiently suffered so painful a death, and so cruel a martyrdom to testify the truth, for to save other, and all to strengthen my soul withal, and my faith to God and love to my neighbour; then doth the Image serve me,

and I not it. And this was the use of Images at the beginning, and of Relics also. And to kneel before the Cross, unto the Word of God, which the Cross preacheth, is not evil. Neither to kneel down before an Image, in a man's meditations, to call the living of the Saint to mind, for to desire God of like grace to follow the ensample, is not an evil. But the abuse of the thing is evil, and to have a false faith; as to bear a piece of the Cross about a man, thinking that, so long as that is about him, spirits shall not come at him, his enemies shall do him no bodily harm, all causes shall go on his side, even for bearing it about him; and to think that if it were not about him, it would not be so; and to think, that if any misfortune chance, that it came for leaving it off, or because this or that ceremony was left undone, and not rather because we have broken God's Commandments, or that God tempteth us, to prove our patience; this is plain idolatry; and here a man is captive, bond and servant unto a false faith, and a false imagination, that is neither God nor His Word . . . " (pp. 59-61, Ed. Parker Society, 1850).

Also, did rugged Latimer speak thus:—

" We salute also and greet well the holy Cross, or the Image of the holy Cross, saying: 'All hail, holy Cross, which hath deserved to bear the precious talent of the world'; and yet who will say that we pray properly to the holy Cross? Whereby it may appear that greeting is one thing, praying another thing. The Cross can neither hear nor speak again, no more than this pulpit; therefore we do salute it, not properly pray to it."

James I. of England and VI. of Scotland—brought up among Presbyterian Protestants—was frequently harassed by uncouth, ignorant, and narrow-minded sectaries. The

following gives an example with respect to the use of Images: "Among other directions sent from the King one was for repairing of the Chapel" (of Holyrood House), "and some English carpenters were employed, who brought with them portraits of the Apostles to be set in the pews or stalls." It was soon rumoured that idols were being set up in the Royal Chapel, and the Bishop of Galloway, who was Dean of the Chapel, wrote to the King on the subject. "The answer returned by the King" (on March 13th, 1617) "was full of anger, objecting ignorance unto them that could not distinguish betwixt pictures intended for ornament and decoration and Images erected for worship and adoration, and resembling them to the Constable of Castile, who, being sent to swear the peace concluded with Spain, when he understood the business was to be performed in the Chapel, where some anthems were to be sung, desired that whatsoever was sung God's name might not be used in it, and that being forborne, he was content they should sing what they listed. 'Just so,' said the King; 'you can endure lions, dragons, devils, to be figured in your Churches, but will not allow the like place to the Patriarchs and Apostles'" (Spottiswoode's "Hist. Ch. Scot.," III., 239, Ed. 1851).

The case of "Boyd and others *v.* Phillpotts" is important in considering the subject of Images. Some of the following quotations are taken from a volume, "The Principal Ecclesiastical Judgments, delivered in the Court of Arches, 1867 to 1875 (p. 115), by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Phillimore, D.C.L." Rivingtons, 1876.

This case referred to the Reredos erected in Exeter Cathedral, on which were a Cross, Images, or Figures; the Reredos was begun in 1873.

We need only consider that point of the trial wherein it

was affirmed by the respondent's counsel that the Reredos was illegal because there were Images thereon :—

1. That they (Images) were contrary to the usage and practice of the pure and Primitive Church.

2. That they were objects of especial censure by those who conducted the Reformation in England.

3. That they were ordered to be moved out of Churches by various authorities having the force of law.

4. That there is a specific statute which renders them illegal.

5. That it is a matter of discretion whether they shall be allowed to remain or not; that discretion ought to be exercised in favour of this removal, inasmuch as they tend to idolatry, forbidden by the Second Commandment, and to superstitions favoured by the Church of Rome and rejected by the Church of England.

Sir Robert agreed with the respondent's counsel that the subtle distinctions which the Church of Rome made, the *latria* due to the Lord, the *doulia* due to the Saint, the *hyperdoulia* due to the Blessed Virgin, led to very great abuse in the direct worship of the Images themselves. The Reformers fought against this abuse. But their Thirtieth Canon says : "*The abuse of a thing doth not take away the use of it*" ; it was "the wisdom of the Church of England in this matter, as well as in her Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes" (Preface to the Prayer Book).

Bishop *Latimer* thus expresses himself: "I said this word 'Saints,' is diversely taken of the vulgar people, Images of Saints are called Saints, and inhabitants of Heaven are called Saints. Now by honouring Saints is meant praying to Saints. Take honouring so, and *Images* for Saints, so Saints are not to be honoured, that is to say, dead Images

are not to be prayed unto . . . and yet I showed the good use of them to be laymen's books, as they be called reverently to look upon them, to remember the things that are signified by them," etc.

Archbishop *Cranmer*, in the "Book of Articles," which he induced the Convocation of 1536 to pass, says of Images: "That they be representers of virtue and good example. That they be stirrers of men's minds, and make them often to remember and lament their sins, especially the Images of Christ and our Lady. That it was meet they should stand in our Churches, but be none otherwise esteemed," etc.

In 1537, "The Institution of a Christian Man": "The Image of our Saviour, as an open book, hangeth on the Cross in the Rood, or is painted in cloths, walls, or windows, to the intent that beside the examples of virtues which we may learn at Christ, we may also be provoked to remember His painful and cruel passion, and also to consider ourselves, when we behold the said Image, and to condemn and abhor our sin, which was the cause of His so cruel death, and thereby to profess that we will no more sin." This book is supposed to have been composed under the auspices of Cranmer.

The Twenty-second Article, written in 1553, was adopted by authority in 1562. The Article of the Council of Trent, which was dated December 4th, 1563, "de invocatione veneratione, et reliquiis sanctorum et sacris imaginibus," though it condemn idolatry, orders due honour and worship (venerationem) to be paid to Images of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints.

The Church of England, holding her middle course, says this worshipping has no authority in Scripture, "immo verbo Dei contradicit" (according to the Latin version), but in no

Article does she say that the erecting of all Images in Churches is repugnant to the Word of God. Bishop Taylor (1613-1667) observes: "The wisdom of the Church was remarkable in the variety of sentences concerning the permission of Images"; that "at first, when they were blended in the dangers and impure mixtures of Gentilism, and men were newly recovered from the snare, and had the reliques of a long custom to superstitions and false worshippings, they endured no Images but merely civil; but that as the danger ceased, and Christianity prevailed, they found that pictures had a natural use of good concernment to move less knowing people, by the representment and declaration of a story; and then they, knowing themselves permitted to the liberties of Christianity, and the restraints of nature and reason, and not being still weak under prejudice and childish dangers, but fortified by the excellence of a wise religion, took them into lawful uses. . . . They transcribed a history . . . into a table, by figures making more lasting impressions than by words and sentences. While the Church stood within these limits she had natural reasons for her warrant, and the custom of several countries, and no precept of Christ to countermand it" (Bishop Taylor's "Tenth Discourse on the Decalogue").

Before he became Archbishop of Canterbury, Tenison wrote a treatise on Idolatry, in which he says: "But for the Images or Pictures of the Saints in their former estate on earth; if they be made with discretion; if they be the representations of such whose saintship no wise man calleth into question; if they be designed as their honourable memorials, they who are wise to sobriety do make use of them; and they are permitted in *Geneva* itself, where remain, in the quire of the Church of S. Peter, the pictures of the

twelve Prophets one side, and on the other those of the twelve Apostles, all in wood; also the pictures of the Virgin and S. Peter in one of the windows. And we give to such pictures that negative honour which they are worthy of. We value them beyond any Images besides that of Christ; we help our memories by them; we forbear all signs of contempt towards them."

The objection to the Images on the ground that by them the Second Commandment was broken, was met by the fact that the Jews were not forbidden to have Images if they did not worship them. There were the winged golden angels, or cherubim, on the Ark, there were the twelve oxen by the molten sea of brass. "But when we consider further, that Solomon caused golden lions to be made about his throne, and the Jews imprinted Images on their money, and in Christ's time they used the Images of Cæsar on their coin and found no reprover for so doing, this shows that there was something in the Commandment that was not moral: I mean the prohibition of making or having any Images. For to these things we find no command of God, no dispensation, no allowance positive, but the immunity of reason, and the indemnity of not being reproved; and therefore, for so much as concerns the making or having pictures and Images, we are at liberty, without the warranty of an express commandment from God" ("Rule of Conscience," Rule VI., Bishop Taylor's Works).

In the Exeter trial concerning the alleged illegality of Figures or Images on the Reredos of the Altar in Exeter Cathedral, we have the following judgment concerning "representations of sacred persons and objects in a Church." (It was urged by one party that the Homilies preached against Images.)

"This recommendation, however, of the Homilies cannot be pressed further than as containing an approbation of 'doctrines,' therein contained, and even that of a qualified character, as being specially necessary for the times when the Articles were framed and published. Now the Homily against the Peril of Idolatry (contained in several parts) sets forth in glowing colours the vanity and folly of paying adoration or worship to Images or Paintings, but it recognizes the original intention of such Images or Paintings to have been the better instructing of the ignorant, as set forth in the letter of Gregory to Serenus (cited by the learned Judge in the Court below). The Homily observes: 'You may withal note that, seeing that there is no ground for worshipping of Images in Gregory's writing, but a plain condemnation thereof, that such as do worship Images, do unjustly allege Gregory for them.' The Homily, however, proceeds to affirm that the worshipping of Images is a necessary consequence of their being allowed to exist, and therefore concludes strongly for their entire abolition, irrespective of actual abuse. Now, it is plain that the 'doctrine' maintained by the Homily is that of the *Twenty-second* Article, and condemns paying 'honour and reverence to Images, as being an act of idolatry, and contrary to the Second Commandment.' In the judgment of its author, the existence of any Image, whether originally intended for instruction or not, is dangerous, as tending to idolatry. This cannot be called doctrine. It is an opinion as to the consequences which might at that time follow the use of representations of sacred objects, and probably the opinion might then be well founded; whilst it is, on the contrary, notorious that numerous sculptures and pictures representing the Saviour and Apostles and other holy men exist, and

have existed for more than two centuries, in and outside of our Churches, to which no worship has been paid. The old associations were broken off, and the old 'monuments of superstition,' had either been removed or become innocuous, before the reign of Elizabeth was closed. . . . What then is the character of the sculpture on the Reredos, in the case before their Lordships? For what purpose had it been set up? To what end is it used? And is it in danger of being abused? It is a sculptured work in high relief, in which are three compartments. That in the centre represents the Ascension of our Lord, in which the Figure of our ascending Lord is separated by a sort of border from the figures of the Apostles, who are gazing upward. The right compartment represents the Transfiguration, and the left the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost. The representations appear to be similar to those with which every one is familiar, in regard to the sacred subjects in question. All the figures are delineated as forming part of the connected representation of the historical subject. It is not suggested that any superstitious reverence has been or is likely to be paid to any figures forming part of the Reredos, and their Lordships are unable to discover anything which distinguishes this representation from the numerous sculptured and painted representations of portions of the sacred history to be found in many of our Cathedrals and parish Churches; and which have been proved by long experience to be capable of remaining there without giving occasion to any idolatrous or superstitious practices. Their Lordships are of opinion that such a decorative work would be lawful in any other part of the Church; and, if so, they are not aware of any contravention of the laws ecclesiastical, by reason of its erection in the particular place which it now

occupies." The respondent was condemned in costs; but experience is generally an expensive acquisition!

As we look now at this Reredos, we wonder that educated, and otherwise sensible, people could have made a fuss about it.

Strype, in his "Memorials Ecclesiastical" (Chap. XVIII., pp. 214-215, Clarendon Press, 1822), speaks of "the Book of the Festival," printed by the famous printer Wynkin de Worde, which book was not completely set aside until the reign of Edward VI. What we read there, in a disquisition on the Second Commandment, seems reasonable with respect to Images: "Men should learn by Images whom they should worship and follow in living. To do God's worship to Images every man is foreboden. Therefore, when thou comest to the Church, first, behold God's Body under the form of Bread and Wine upon the Altar, and thank Him that He vouchsafes every day to come from the holy Heaven above for the health of thy soul. Look thou upon the Cross, and thereby have mind of the Passion He suffered for thee. Then on the Images of the Holy Saints, not believing on them"—the Images, we suppose, as possessing power in themselves—"but that by the sight of them thou mayest have mind on them that be in Heaven, and so to follow their life as much as thou mayest."

We are well able to understand how the picture or image of a deceased holy person can help, through the Holy Spirit, to encourage a struggling Christian by bringing before his mind's eye scenes and actions of that Saint's sufferings and bravery, as when we read that S. Peter Neri, when praying, often had before him the picture of that "admirable champion" Savonarola, so full of faith, and so replete with love for God.

In a work well known at one time, "The Diary of a late

Physician," by Warren, is a touching story of a poor gentlewoman afflicted by cancer. She requested that a letter from her still absent husband might be held before her eyes while the very painful operation of removing the cancer from her breast was being endured by her; the sight of this letter enabled her, in God's mercy, to concentrate her will and absolute attention upon the thought and love of her husband far away in a foreign land, and with the happiest result. Even if the story be imaginary merely, it is possible.

The mind, which easily wanders in prayer or in some other sacred matter, may be focussed to an intense meditation by outward objects in a Church, until that outward and visible object itself may be no longer consciously observed and noticed, and that outward visible sign has been sacramentalized by having been made in God's Hands the means of acquiring an inward spiritual grace.

Or to take a very simple occurrence which happened some years ago in Cape Colony, in which country it was narrated to the writer. An Englishman, having landed, proceeded up country, carrying with him a tame and healthy blackbird. People trooped for miles to hear and see this bird. Why? Because in that country, where birds have no song worth speaking of, the blackbird's liquid notes were refreshing; perhaps this was partly the cause of the people going to the blackbird's cottage, but for a greater reason than for the mere sound of its music; it reminded them of the "Old Country," it brought to their minds the recollection of England's rich meadows, her tall trees, her luxuriant hedgerows, and men's eyes grew moist; the sober coated blackbird —so common in our country—reminded the listeners of "*home*." The owner refused more than once to take £10 for the songster. This bird was to the people as an Image of

"old England"; through the blackbird's ministry their minds were carried more than six thousand miles, from the great Southern continent to the little Island in the dark, storm-beaten Northern Sea.

So may an Image, rightly regarded and reflected on, be the means of concentrating the mind wandering in prayer, or under many other circumstances.

We have already referred to the custom of the German Protestants in having Crucifixes and Images of Saints in the meeting-houses, but we just add now what was said by the Divines sent over to England, by the Protestant Princes of Germany in 1539: "We do not reject the Images of Christ and of the Saints, but the adoration made to them, whereof idolatry is sprung."

With this statement of the foremost men from among the original and genuine Protestants of Germany, in the name of "the Protestant Faith"—whatever that may be—contrast the protest made against the Reredos in general, and the Crucifix in particular, which gives grandeur and colour to S. Paul's!

It was actually asserted that it promoted idolatry; but the alleged weak-minded individual was not produced. Whether he had existed but in the fertile and distorted minds of these "Protestants," or whether the individual had gravitated towards his natural centre of Colney Hatch, or Hanwell Lunatic Asylum, we know not.

The Lord Bishop of London exercised his veto, and ordered that nothing in the way of legal action should be taken for the removal of the Reredos.

Personally we would rather not have a Crucifix represented over the Altar Table, as we do not consider that to be the proper situation for it. For the Altar Service is a

mighty Eucharistia, "giving of thanks," a Sacrifice truly, but an Unbloody Sacrifice, and it seems to us unsuitable to have a Crucifix on or over the Holy Table. "It is to be noted that wherever the dead or suffering Christ is represented on a decorated Cross, there is a confusion of ideas. . . . The vacant Cross, like the empty tomb, speaks of Him as not here, but risen, and when adorned or combined with the circle, it speaks of Him as clothed with majesty and honour, for ever and ever." Would that one might venture to hope that that beautiful ornament, the Triptych, glowing with gold and colours, may in time be more generally used by us than it is at present; some who have seen examples of the Triptychs, in Southern Germany may have fellow-feeling with the writer, namely, those who have not only beheld, but also remained long enough to admire and examine the Painting of "The Adoration of the Lamb," by the brothers Van Eyck (finished in 1432), in the Cathedral of S. Bavon, at Ghent. What a glorious Altar-piece, and why have we not more examples of this School? Copies, of course. What could be more lovely than Triptychs, painted after the manner of the well-known fragment, representing "The Elect," in Fra Angelico's glorious painting, "The Day of Judgment"—fifteenth century—preserved in the Accademia delle Belle Arti, at Florence! But *we* prefer cold figures in white stone, or blobs of coloured marbles, fixed into a wall, reminding one of sea-anemones: this production goes by the name of "Reredos."

Of course, not all inanimate representations in Churches are to be considered exactly the same in honour, or demanding exactly the same outward respect. The writer himself never finds a Figure, a Crucifix, or a Cross of any use to him in the concentrating of his mind, although the sight of a mass

of fine carving, a contrast of light and shade in a Church, by its general effect does help to produce a feeling of surrounding spiritual calm and holiness; the Single Figure he never uses, but he has no right to judge others whom the sight of a single Image, or of a Cross, does assist, by producing a concentration of thought, a help against irritating lack of sequence. And the writer himself feels it quite natural to draw a distinction between a Cross and a Crucifix: the former reminds one of our Redemption, it is the sign which, devoutly used, serves to emphasize the acclamation of one's creed, it is the sign at which Satan's hosts flee, it is the emblem of Christianity; but a Crucifix is the representation of Christ's own Personality: at the sight of the latter the writer never fails to take off his hat as he passes; he ventures to consider that in his own case and feelings this is προσκύνησις, or at least "due reverence."

There is surely something more in a Cross than two crossed sticks; it is a symbol, "something which represents something else," namely, the religion of Christ. If it were not so, why were Dutchmen centuries ago compelled to trample a Cross under foot before they could be permitted to trade in Japan? It was because the Japanese heathen and idolaters were logical enough to understand that to scorn and insult the Cross was to scorn and insult Christianity. Yet many Protestants—the Irish Orangemen, for instance—talk as though the Cross were a Popish idol; they actually will not have a Cross inside the Church! Surely, if they were consistent, they would object to the "Union Jack," containing as it does the Cross of S. George of England, the Cross of S. Andrew of Scotland, and that of S. Patrick of Ireland, or to the doors in private houses, of which doors the rails and styles between the panels do actually form a Cross.

We here enter a protest—one sure to be unpopular—against the use of a central Cross on Altar Frontals. We are quite aware that this custom is generally considered to be "*High Church*," and even Catholic. We venture to be of opinion that a Cross in this position and locality is modern and unsuitable, possibly the use is the invention of those people who have caused us much evil through their many inventions, viz., the "Ecclesiastical Furnishers."

Within the "Altar Rails"—call them the "Communion Rails" if you like—one Cross, that on the Holy Table or Retable, is sufficient; even this is not *de rigueur*.

The decoration of the Frontal should not be of such a nature or pattern as to draw attention to any particular point or part thereof, or away from the Altar Cross: it should produce the impression of being a whole in treatment. If the Frontal be decorated, it should be with a decoration equally dispersed over the whole space, as in the old system of "powderings"; this does not apply to the orphries, the use of which is also not *de rigueur*.

As things are now one often sees three Crosses, on the Frontal, on the Retable, on the Reredos. Why?

In addition, Altar bouquets, in which the flowers are arranged to form Crosses; so we have five Crosses! Why? Owing to lack of knowledge, thought, sense, and good taste.

Some years ago, the writer having entered a Protestant Chapel (in Peterborough?), saw a Crucifixion in the window of the front; perhaps this Crucifix of painted glass was not objected to, because the congregation were wont to sit with their backs to it!

But it is useful to study the custom and teaching of the Eastern Orthodox and Catholic Church, inasmuch as she uses much outward action in the veneration of Images, is

conservative, and utterly refuse *latria*, *hyperdoulia*, or *doulia*, to any Image.

The Russian "Longer Catechism" (Blackmore's Translation, pp. 125-6, pub. Masters), speaks thus on the Second Commandment:—

"On the Second Commandment.

"*Q.* What is a *graven Image*, as spoken of in the Second Commandment?

"*A.* The Commandment itself explains that a graven Image, or Idol, is the likeness of some creature, in Heaven, or earth, or in the waters, which men bow down to and serve, instead of God.

"*Q.* What is forbidden then by the Second Commandment?

"*A.* We are forbidden to bow down to graven Images or Idols, as to supposed deities, or as to likenesses of false gods.

"*Q.* Are we not hereby forbidden to have any sacred representations whatever?

"*A.* By no means. This very plainly appears from hence, that the same Moses, through whom God gave the Commandment against graven Images, received at the same time from God an order to place in the Tabernacle, or movable Temple of the Israelites, sacred representations of Cherubim in gold, and to place them too in that inner part of the Temple to which the people turned for the worship of God.

"*Q.* Why is this example worthy of remark for the Orthodox Christian Church?

"*A.* Because it illustrates her use of holy Icons.

"*Q.* What is an Icon?

"*A*. The word is Greek, and means an *Image* or representation. In the Orthodox Church this name designates sacred representations of our Lord Jesus Christ, God incarnate, His Immaculate Mother, and His Saints.

"*Q*. Is the use of holy Icons agreeable to the Second Commandment?

"*A*. It would then and then only be otherwise, if anyone were to make gods of them; but it is not in the least contrary to this Commandment to honour Icons, as sacred representations, and to use them for the religious remembrance of God's works and of His Saints; for when thus used Icons are books, written with the forms of persons and things, instead of letters (See Greg. Magn., Ep. 1. IX., Ep. 9, ad Seren. Episc).

"*Q*. What disposition of mind should we have, when we reverence the Icons?

"*A*. While we look on them with our eyes, we should mentally look to God and to the Saints, who are represented on them.

"*Q*. What general name is there for sin against the Second Commandment.

"*A*. *Idolatry*."

The celebrated Metropolitan of Moscow, Platon (A.D. 1737-1812), wrote: "It is necessary to be known that the obeisance performed before the picture of the Saviour and that before the picture of any of the Saints, though to appearance the same, yet in reality is very different indeed, for the worship which I perform before the picture of the Saviour consists in the deepest humility of soul before Him as Lord and Creator of all, but that which I perform before the pictures of the Saints is a reverence which I render to them out of a loving heart as His favourites."

"It is worth while to remark in passing, that, whatever may be the right view of the abstract question respecting Pictures or Icons, and the showing of outward respect to them, the Russians cannot be reasonably blamed for revering a usage which they received together with Christianity itself" (A.D. 987), "and the first introduction of which was made, in part at least, the instrument of so blessed a result as the conversion of the great Prince Vladimir, the Constantine of their Church and nation" (Mouravieff's "History of Russian Church," Notes on p. 353).

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI.

1. A reader possessing antiquarian tastes may like to be informed of two particular forms in which Images were treated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and in the sixteenth.

In the two first, Images were frequently so constructed that they could be opened, in order that the interior could be seen, containing figures or sculptured scenes, to remind the beholders of some Scripture narrative. There is, or was formerly, in the Louvre a well-preserved statue of the Blessed Virgin, which could be opened in three parts, while inside each was a sculptured scene from Holy Scripture In the sixteenth century, painted figures on Limoges enamel became fashionable, instead of the beautiful Images in ivory of periods more artistic in religious matters or in art. These Limoges Figures opened right and left like the wings of a Triptych.

2. "Many of our clergy and laity, departing from the Apostolical traditions, have introduced pernicious novelties. They took down the Crosses in the Churches and put Images in their room, before which they lighted up lamps and burned incense, honouring them as the Cross. They sang before them, worshipped them, and implored their succour. Many dressed the female Images with robes, and made them stand godmothers to their children. They offered up hair to them when they cut it off for the first time. Some Presbyters scratched off the paint from

the Images and mixed it with the Holy Eucharist, and gave it in the Communion. Others put the Body of the Lord into the hands of the Images, and made the communicants take it out thence. Others used boards with pictures painted on them instead of an Altar, on which they consecrated the elements; and many such-like abuses were committed. Therefore the Orthodox Emperors and the most learned Bishops, assembled in council, have forbidden these enormities, and have removed the Images to higher places in the Church, where they stood formerly and when they were not worshipped—as they have been of late—by ignorant people. Some of the complainers are gone to Rome to culminate us there; but we are orthodox; we believe the Trinity, one God in Three Persons, the Incarnation of the Word, His two Wills and two operations; we implore the intercession of the Holy Virgin, the Mother of God, and of all the Saints; we reverence their relics; we receive all the Apostolical traditions, and the Decrees of the Six Councils" (From the letter written to Louis the Pious by Michael II., "Balbus," 820-827, Emperor of the Eastern Empire: *cf.* Jortin's "Ecclesiastical History"). It is to be noted that Images were neither forbidden nor cast out of the Church after the enormities above mentioned, but placed in an elevated part of the building as objects of beauty and respect, in which position they could not be "worshipped."

3. The French historian, Fleury (1640-1723), gives the following as part of the Confession of Faith published with the authority of the Second Council of Nicæa: "We receive, besides the figure of the Cross, the relics of Saints and their Images; we embrace them according to the ancient tradition of our fathers, who have placed them in all the Churches of God, and in all the places where He is served. We honour and adore them, viz., that of Jesus Christ, of His holy Mother, of the angels, for though they are incorporeal they have revealed themselves in a human form, those of the Apostles, the Prophets, the Martyrs, and other Saints because those paintings recall to us the memory of the originals, and make us participate in their sanctity."

While there is so much of fraud and of worship of Images in the Roman Church, it by no means follows that any such evils would arise in the Anglican Communion from the use of Images, and this from the point of view which relates to Art. Over and over again one has noticed abroad that worship of Images is often confined to those which are utterly void of artistic merit or religious beauty.

The following words were written by Dean Milman of S. Paul's (d. 1868), and are quoted in Sir Robert Phillimore's previously-mentioned work. "So in general, the ruder the art the more intense the superstition. The perfection of the fine arts leads rather to diminish than to promote such superstition. Not merely does the cultivation of mind required for their higher execution, as well as the admiration of them, imply an advanced state, but the idealism, which is their crowning excellence, in some degree unrealizes them and creates a different and more exalted feeling. There is more direct idolatry paid to the rough and ill-shapen Image, or the flat, unrelieved, and staring picture—the former actually clothed in gaudy and tinsel ornaments, the latter with the crown of gold-leaf on the head, and real or artificial flowers in the hand—than to the noblest ideal statue, or the Holy Family, with all the magic of light and shade. They are not the fine paintings which work miracles, but the coarse and smoke-darkened boards, on which the dim outline of form is hardly to be traced. Thus it may be said that it was the superstition which required the Images, rather than the Images which formed the superstition" ("History of Latin Christianity," Vol. II., p. 152, first published in 1855).

And Ruskin writes on this subject: ". . . the debased manufacture of wooden and waxen Images, which is the support of Romanist idolatry all over the world . . . the manufacture of puppets, however influential on the Romanist mind of Europe, is certainly not deserving of consideration as one of the fine arts. . . . Idolatry, it cannot be too often repeated, is no encourager of the fine arts. But, on the other hand, the highest branches of the fine arts are no encouragers either of idolatry or of religion. No picture of Leonardo's or Raphael's, no statue of Michael Angelo's, has ever been worshipped, except by accident. Carelessly regarded, and by ignorant persons, there is less to attract in them than in commoner works. Carefully regarded, and by intelligent persons, they instantly divert the mind from their subject to their art, so that admiration takes the place of devotion. I do not say that the Madonna di S. Sisto, the Madonna del Cardellino, and such others, have not had considerable religious influence on certain minds, but I say that on the mass of the people of Europe they have had none whatever; while by far the greater number of the most celebrated statues and pictures are never regarded with any other feelings than those of admiration of human beauty or reverence for human skill. Effective

religious art, therefore, has always lain, and I believe must always lie, between the two extremes—of barbarous idol-fashioning on one side and magnificent craftsmanship on the other. It consists . . . partly in glass painting, partly in rude sculpture on the outsides of buildings, partly in mosaics, and partly in the frescoes and tempera pictures which in the fourteenth century formed the link between this powerful, because imperfect, religious art and the impotent perfection which succeeded it" ("Stones of Venice," Vol. II., Chap. IV.).

We may be permitted to annotate on these lines of Mr. Ruskin. The great Art critic, when speaking of the "highest branches" and "perfection of the fine arts," refers to the magnificent colourings and the perfect anatomy of the Raphaelite and post-Raphaelite Renaissance period. This style of realistic representation of biceps and other muscles, and of the "naked truth" of human anatomy, is just what we do not want to be placed in our Churches, though pictures of this character swarm in Roman Churches, especially when built in that style of Revived Paganism which is called "Renaissance," and abroad frequently "Le style Jesuit." We need stiff and conventional forms, such as one so frequently sees on the superb fronts of some of the ancient French Gothic Cathedrals. The two extreme styles of paintings one sees especially in the South of Europe, where the vigorous grandeur of the Gothic style is so seldom to be met with, almost never.

One reason whereby the Southern races delight in tawdriness and the gilt-gingerbread style, and in realistic pictures—*e.g.*, those of "The Sacred Heart," with its repulsive delineation of copious blood—was given us in the neighbourhood of Genoa by a Professor of one of the best-known Italian Universities. The writer remarked on the difference of taste in Church ornamentation held by Northern and Southern Europeans: we love the long, lofty, Gothic Nave and Chancel, where a certain gloom prevents a complete apprehension of distant objects; the Southerner admires the wide, comparatively low, bright Nave of the Renaissance, realistic representations of Purgatory, and Images crowned with flowers. The Italian replied: "We Italians, as a mass, do not care to think deeply, we like realism, to have everything set before us so that we can receive impressions without being much troubled; you Northerners, on the other hand, read more solid literature than we, you do not like everything to be unveiled, but wish for something to remain undefined, you are mystic in your natures"—some such words as these. The

objection to crude realism in religious art was strongly felt in certain Italian Schools of painting in the most devotional period.

How beautifully peaceful the interior of a Church may be, and how hosts of Saints may be painted without overshadowing the dominant Cross, is put before us by Mr. Ruskin in the work just quoted.

"The great mosaics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries covered the walls and roofs of the Churches with inevitable lustre; they could not be ignored or escaped from; their size rendered them majestic, their distance mysterious, their colour attractive. . . . They were before the eyes of the devotee at every interval of his worship; vast shadowings forth of scenes to whose realization he looked forward, or of spirits whom he invoked. And the man must be little capable of receiving a religious impression of any kind who, to this day, does not acknowledge some feeling of awe as he looks up to the pale countenances and ghostly forms which haunt the dark roofs of the Baptisteries of Parma and Florence, or remains altogether untouched by the majesty of the colossal Images of Apostles, and of Him Who sent Apostles, that look down from the darkening gold of the domes of Venice and Pisa."

However beautiful Mr. Ruskin's language, even this gives but a comparatively small idea of these fanes, as we who have seen Parma and S. Mark's can testify; the feeling could not be repressed, "The Lord is in this place."

A writer in "The Contemporary Review," for September, 1895, says: "It would not be hard to make both Cathedrals and Churches tell, by means of pictures, tales of what our fathers have done, which would shame our self-satisfied children. It is not hard to understand how the Church might to-day, as in the past, use the art and knowledge of the time, as aids to worship. Perfect forms cannot, indeed, make men worship, any more than masts and sails can make a ship to move. But forms shaped by art and knowledge, and filled with the Spirit of God, assist worship, as sails filled with the winds of Heaven assist the ship in its course."

We have the more pleasure in making use of the above words as a quotation, inasmuch as the article containing them makes statements on other points with which we cannot agree.

In July, 1895, certain newly-sculptured figures in Lichfield Cathedral were dedicated. The preacher, on this occasion, was his Grace the Lord Archbishop of York (Dr. Maclagan). He spoke of the place of

art in the Christian Church, drawing the attention of his auditors to the fact that *architecture*, which produced Churches, and *music*, which they used in praising God, were part of "Art." "Why, if the assistance of architecture and music was welcomed, should other departments of art, such as sculpture, be less highly valued? To understand present feeling in this matter, it was necessary to look back at the history of art in the Christian Church. In the Jewish Church, indeed, its *idolatrous* use had been prohibited; but that the prohibition of the Second Commandment was confined to such a limitation was manifest. It was directed against the abuse, not against the use of art; had it been otherwise even the family portrait must have fallen beneath its condemnation. So far was this from being the case, however, that the principle of artistic representation, as well as its symbolic use (as in the case of the Cherubim overshadowing the Mercy Seat) had been accepted in Old Testament times. The brazen serpent, too, was an Image, not only to be used in the worship of God, but one to which the eyes of men were turned for the salvation of their bodies, if not of their souls. It was only when it was turned into an idol that the destruction of the serpent was commanded. In like manner the principle of the adoption of ornamental art received sanction from the Temple of Solomon. Coming to the earliest ages of the Christian Church we find the use of art turned to very scanty account. The fact was that Old Testament restraints still possessed great influence, whilst the idolatrous character of the surroundings of those early days greatly hindered the use of pictorial art. Not that such a state of things was even then universal. Even in the catacombs symbolism was to be found, especially in reference to the life of our Blessed Lord, whilst representations of typical incidents in Old Testament history were not wanting. One point, however, in this connection called for notice. In such early representations of our Blessed Lord nothing painful was to be found. It was in such characters as that of the Good Shepherd that the primitive Christians delighted to portray Him. Even when after centuries—not before—He was at all depicted as upon the Cross, it was in the full appearance of complete vigour that He was delineated offering the sacrifice of a perfect humanity. It was reserved for mediævalism to provide the more painful representations, with which we were familiar. It was time that we should return to the earlier conceptions and representations. Art claimed to have taken her proper

place under Constantine, who in later days revived and, so to speak, established the Christian Church—a period when the smaller oratories began to give way to statelier Churches. The Cathedrals and Churches of our own land, many of them with their fine sculptures, within and without, evidenced a like appreciation on the part of the Church of England. It was no wonder indeed, that at the time of the blessed Reformation, this development should have received a check, and have taken an inclination more similar to that of primitive times. The idolatrous use of Sculptures and Images, in the part of the Western Church with which we were most closely allied, naturally created distrust, and the idea in the minds of many was how to destroy them. But with the great revival of Church life in our times, there has sprung up a desire for the renewed employment of art in the service of God—a desire often almost unconsciously entertained by those whom it animated. Nor was this desire confined to mere æstheticism, which would be but the luxury of art. It benefited also the unlearned and uneducated poor, to whom indeed it might well prove often more powerful and helpful, than many discourses. He hoped that the day was not far distant when there might be a great extension of art in this direction, especially in neighbourhoods largely populated by the very poor, and he believed that great helpfulness existed for the poor in such artistic productions, as had that day been dedicated in their Cathedral. For what was the true purpose and function of art in the Christian life? The artist was one of the noblest of the gifts of God—none nobler, except that of the priests of the Lord, the ministers of our God. The highest employment therefore must be in His service. Its supreme idea was the revelation of God in His dealings, alike with the greatest and with the least of His creatures. Not less was this so with reference to His works of grace. As they looked upon such representations of Saints and Angels, they must perceive that the mission and prerogative of the true artist was not only to reproduce facts, but also to translate them into the ideal; or, if these facts lay beyond earthly vision, to induce emulation by the history of such recorded lives. And what was the object of art in regard to the ends and aims of the individual Christian? For example, what was to be the outcome of the additions which had been made that day to that Cathedral? It was that by these revelations of God and His grace, under the forms of His faithful servants there depicted, their own

hearts should be filled with thankfulness, and a desire to push onward to the following of the blessed Saints in all virtuous and godly living" (Copied from "The Church Times," for August 2nd, 1895).

4. We add a few lines respecting a Picture and Image, commonly to be seen in Churches of the Roman Obedience. We refer to the Picture illustrating the sheet, inculcating the "Worship of the Sacred Heart," to the Image of the Saviour, on the outside of Whose garments is a bright red Heart, from which rises a flame. It has been suggested that the principle herein involved, recalls to mind the strong objection raised by the orthodox Christians during the Nestorian controversy, because the latter made a separation between our Lord's Godhead and His Manhood, worshipping the One but not the Other; this divorce was most strongly condemned. Also, that in the modern Romish superstition, it is even but a *part* of our Lord's human Nature that is worshipped, that physical human portion of His humane frame, His human, natural Heart.

But we think it manifestly unfair to accuse the Romans of having fallen into ancient heresy because of this "Worship of the Sacred Heart." A danger may exist, however, inasmuch as there is a tendency towards materialism in the minds of many; at all events, to the religious metaphysical mind there is an appearance of crudity which finds its natural goal in vulgarity. One consideration alone should be sufficient to prevent the appearance of this Image in our Churches—the modernity of its use, and a localism opposed to the English mind; yet we have seen it in an English Church.

But more than this. We now see Images of the Blessed Virgin with a heart similarly portrayed; as the God-Man is represented, *so must be the Virgin Mother who commands her Son!* True, here the term "Sacred Heart" is not employed, but instead "*The Immaculate Heart*," which, by-the-bye, is worshipped with *hyperdoulia*, and it is stated that the natural, physical heart is taken as being a natural and convenient symbol of the Virgin's charity and virtues.

But, surely, we have before us the holy life, the absolute submission of the highest of all creatures; should not this suffice for the Catholic, for every devout Christian, even for every chivalrous man?

In this we again see the modern spirit of materialism and of crude realism. We know that the Virgin is more appealed to by the many than is our Lord. To prophesy is generally foolish, and to draw a

cheque on the bank of futurity is frequently the recourse of one whose ignorance seeks to avoid discussion. But it may be argued from analogy that it is quite within the bounds of possibility—even of probability—that the worship of the "Immaculate Heart" may in time supersede that of the "Sacred Heart"; the use of the former is even more modern than that of the latter.

CHAPTER VII.

Concerning Relics.

IT is "to be remarked that the Article relates not to the reverence of Relics . . . but to '*the superstitions in their veneration*,' which the Council of Trent had to forbid" (Bishop Forbes).

The words of the Tridentine Council in the matter of Relics were: "The Council commands all Bishops and all others discharging the office and cure of instruction . . . to instruct diligently the faithful, teaching them . . . that the *holy bodies* of the holy martyrs and others living with Christ, which were living members of Christ, and a temple of the Holy Ghost, to be raised by Him to eternal life and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, by *which* many benefits are conferred on mankind: so that they who affirm that veneration and honour is not to be owed to the Relics of the Saints, or that they (the Relics) and other sacred monuments are uselessly honoured by the faithful, and that the tombs and shrines of the Saints are in vain frequented for the purpose of obtaining their help, are to be altogether accursed." (The italicized "*which*" refers to "the holy bodies.")

Reliques, Relics (Greek, λείψανα), are not in themselves to be scoffed at. The ragged flag of a regiment, dirty as it

may be, is hung up in a Cathedral, or in some Church connected perhaps locally with a territorial regiment. Any member of that regiment, be he officer or private, cannot but look upon that ragged relic with a sense of honourable pride. To such a beholder that flag speaks with power, telling him how those before him suffered hardship, hunger, thirst, wounds, lying all night on the battle-field, the frost or chilling mist eating into those wounds which he had gained in the defence of his Sovereign and of his country: that flag is to him a precious "*Relic*."

Under the dome of S. Paul's lie, enclosed in imperishable marble or granite, the remains of a mighty chief, Arthur, Duke of Wellington, and of the greatest Admiral that has ever been, who, as he lay a-dying, said, "Thank God, I've done my duty," over whose grave at his funeral the loving seamen tore in pieces the flag which had belonged to the famous "Victory," in order that they might possess, to be shown perhaps in after years to children yet unborn, "*Relics*."

In the "Painted Hall" at Greenwich, under a glass case, lie some clothes, not at all artistic, stained with blood, yet people look silently, with much of reverence, on those garments; old men lead up little children to look on them, while the grey-headed ones tell animated stories of these stained clothes and of him who once wore them; for they are potent "*Relics*," telling the nation of our power to remain free from the thraldom of the greatest warrior of modern times, of our power—under God's guidance—to destroy all attempts of Spain to recover her Naval power, to be the chief means of curbing the lust of European dominion in one person at whose name all trembled save the natives of these islands, the person and the name of Napoleon—for

these tarnished, blood-stained old clothes were those which Nelson wore on the fateful, glorious day which shall for ever in this world make "the Cape of Laurels" a household word in history: these clothes are "*Relics*."

So men venerate the names and relics of those who have excelled in worldly arms: how much more may not those of saintly men be venerated, looked at with feelings of loving reverence, or the dwelling where such an one has lived who has striven to make the world better, or the little Book of Devotion which once belonged to some saintly woman! The sight of such monuments as these may be, should be, beneficial to the reflective mind of one not forgetful of his latter end.

Who can have seen, and mused in, the famous Monastery where once lived the sweetly-natured S. Francis of Assisi but has had brought before him an example of a great mystery—how near a man can be to his Saviour in his daily life of prayer, of trials, of temptation!

The sight of Milan's glittering Duomo is no greater testimony to religion and to love, the view of distant Monte Rosa — snow-clad, flushed rosy with the sunrise — is no more powerful testimony to the beauty and majesty of God, than the life of the mighty S. Ambrose, fearless of the conquering monarch; while the sight of the wooden Crucifix which the devoted S. Charles Borromeo bore about with him when he ministered to his plague-stricken children in 1576, the sight of this should produce in the mind of the beholder admiration for the holy Bishop who thus "fulfilled the law of Christ." Such power of producing holy thoughts "*Relics*" may possess, and when the writer saw lately in the aforesaid Duomo of Milan the remains of the saintly Charles in the coffin of crystal, and also the Cross of

magnificent emeralds, a Queen's tribute, he felt that these glittering gems were as nothing compared with the embrowned "Relic" which he beheld, and he did not fail to utter a prayer that the world might see more men following so closely in the footsteps of the Shepherd of our souls.

What are the old letters yellow with age, split at the folds, which the old man gazes upon through tears, perhaps a man whom Fortune has favoured, as people say—what are these but "*Relics*," *reliquiæ*, things left behind from "a vanished hand"?

The little shoes, or broken toys—which the now childless woman keeps secreted in a drawer always locked, of which she alone has the key, reminding her of the "sound of a voice that is still"—such things left behind are "Relics": they call to mind the darling taken away from the evil to come.

But—how fatal "but" often is!—such Relics must be authentic, genuine. Other letters equally old, equally yellow and ragged, would be rejected with a scorn mingled with an angry sadness; other toys, equally broken, might be presented, but with what result? Even gold, that general panacea of healing, could not make up for the loss of these "Relics."

The great mass of Relics exhibited throughout the Roman Communion are unreliable, or patent forgeries.

We have already said that at an early period in the Church Martyrs were looked upon with much veneration, and rightly so. They were considered to have entered Heaven immediately after their death, indeed, the Martyr's death was prized as sin-atoning, "Lavacrum sanguinis"; even those who, owing to unavoidable causes, had been unbaptized, were reckoned as though they had been by their "Baptism of blood."

Eusebius ("Demonstr. Evang.," XIII., 11) favours the honouring of their remains, quoting Plato, who said that those heroes who fell fighting for their country should be regarded as beneficent spirits.

Theodoret (Bishop of Cyrus in Syria, d. 457) says that our Lord substituted Martyrs (*τοὺς οἰκείους νέκρους*) for the ancient Pagan heroes.

The Thirtieth Canon of the "Apostolic Constitutions" (end of third century) bids the faithful to copy the example of Joseph, who honoured the remains of his father (Exodus l.), and refers to 2 Kings xiii. 6, where we read of the dead man being restored to life when his body had touched the bones of Elisha.

Eusebius ("Hist. Eccl.," VIII., 6) relates that during the time of Diocletian's persecution (303, etc.) the heathen of Nicomedia dug up the remains of Martyrs in order to prevent the Christians honouring them.

We can thoroughly understand how it was that of the bones of the aged Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna (burnt at the stake about A.D. 160), it is written: "*τιμώτερα λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίον*"—"more precious than jewels, more tried than gold."

But the first mention of enclosed Relics is found, we believe, in the Acts of Martyrdom of S. Ignatius. The "Acta martyrii sancti Ignatii," extant in five parts, may be merely legendary, they are certainly not lacking in contradictory statements. He is stated to have been martyred at Rome, it is supposed A.D. 115 or in 107, or between A.D. 100-118, according to Bishop Lightfoot, or according to Harnack, soon after A.D. 130; an Eastern writer, on the contrary, maintains that S. Ignatius was thrown to the lions A.D. 115. Whichever idea be the right one we need not

trouble about it, we find it stated that there remained but the hardest or strongest of the Martyr's bones, which were taken to Antioch, and enclosed in a case, or reliquary, as an inestimable treasure of the Church.

The Fathers held different opinions as to the veneration of Relics, even some who opposed honouring (worship?) of Images, advocating the practice. S. Augustine speaks of miracles having been performed by the touching of Relics. But S. Augustine himself was well aware that in his time many "Relics"—so-called—were neither more nor less than frauds, for he refers to certain vagabond fraudulent monks who went about selling what they affirmed to be genuine Relics of particular Saints ("alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrum, venditant," "others sell Relics of Martyrs—if indeed they be Relics of Martyrs"), implying much doubt as to their genuineness ("De Opera Monachorum," c. 28). The law that in or under every Altar a Saint's Relic should be placed, this caused a demand for Relics which could always be supplied. About the tenth century, dark, ignorant, and wicked, Spanheim writes, in connection with this subject: "Nullum opportunius tempus fovendæ augendæque principum populorumque superstitioni, hoc ipso ignaro indocto, pollutoque tot flagitiis sæculo. Hinc miraculosæ corporum, cinerum, ossium, membrorum, sanguinis, supellectilis, hujus et illius martyris, sæpe ignoti fictique, inventiones, etc., toto pene orbo christiano facto reliquiario" ("Sæc." X., Chap. IV.).

Rodolphus, who lived in the eleventh century, gives the ways and means whereby the necessary Relics were obtained by the collector and merchant: "Effodiebat e tumulis clancule ossa evellens a cineribus nuperrime defunctorum hominum; sicque imposita in diversis apophoretis ven-

ditabat apud plurimos pro sanctorum martyrum seu confessorum reliquiis" ("Hist.," Book IV., Chap. III.).

Theodosius I., in 386, found so much imposture already connected with Relics, that he forbad traffic in them, forbidding that bodies should be transported from one place to another, but permitting Churches to be built over the earthly resting places, the graves, of Martyrs.

In 592 a Council was held in Saragossa which, in its Second Canon, gave directions whereby false Relics might be distinguished from the true.

The Second Council of Nicæa ordered that no Church should be consecrated without having some Relics in it; in Rome itself an impetus was given to Relic hunting and Relic trading when, in 761, Pope Paul I. removed the bodies of Saints from without to within the walls of the city.

In 1215, in a Council held at the Vatican (the Fourth Lateran Council), the merchandise of new Relics was forbidden, unless these Relics had first been sanctioned by the Pope of Rome, and directions were issued that Bishops should take precaution that their congregations should not be deceived "variis figmentis et falsis documentis, sicut in plerisque locis occasione quæstus fieri consuevit." So it was possible that congregations had been deceived by "various figments and false documents"! And the Bishop of Rome, either by himself or in assembly, was to guarantee all new relics! Why, the very foundation of Papal temporalities, the exaltation of his spiritual claims and universal dominion, all this was actually founded on "variis figmentis et falsis documentis"! To conclude that a Papacy which was bolstered up by the "Forged Donation of Constantine," by Forged Decretals, by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decrees, to suppose that people who could be taken in by such docu-

ments, replete with linguistic errors, distorted historic facts, and interpolated, unhistoric fiction—to imagine that such people in general, or the Pope in particular, could be the judge of Relics, was an absurdity. On the other hand, if the Popes of Rome were not themselves deceived by these forgeries, they must, as God's vicegerents, have been guilty of a lengthy, systematic course of conscious fraud: but it was really a case of unconscious ignorance.

Milman wrote: "The fondness for cherishing memorials of the beloved, in human nature so excusable and amiable." This sentiment alone at first caused the preservation and honouring of Relics, but laudable and pious motives mingled with superstitious fancies, and at length in all parts these fancies gave way to fraudulent motives, producing legions of "Relics," many being but multiples of one and the same Relic; indeed it became considered hardly an immoral action to steal much-valued Relics from their legitimate owner, as did Eginhard when he stole those of S. Benedict in Italy and carried them into his own country. One cannot but regret the loss of some things which by this time would have become Relics of priceless value: as, for instance, the following letter. When the Lombards were about to march to Rome in 752, Stephen II., Bishop of Rome, summoned King Pepin to his assistance by means of a letter written by S. Peter, bidding the King proceed at once to assist Rome: "I, S. Peter the Apostle . . . the Mother of God likewise, adjure, admonish, and command you . . . to save the beloved city Rome from the detestable Lombards. If you hasten, I, Peter the Apostle, promise you my protection in this life, and in the next," etc., etc.

If this celestial communication could but be seen now! The whole result was most gratifying. Success amply

rewarded the production of another document, which would also be a valuable Relic in the nineteenth century.

There was shown to Pepin a deed of gift, whereby it was proved that Constantine the Great had presented to the Pope of Rome, not only the city of Rome, but also the exarchate of Ravenna; much aggrandisement accrued to Papal authority.

This would indeed have been a treasure of a Relic! The document is now known as "*The Forged Donation of Constantine.*"

But, turning from such a thing, let us speak of some of those countless "Relics" which, under pain of anathema, Romanists are to venerate—in certain cases, according to some Romish writers, even to worship with the supreme worship due to God, that of *latria.*

Mabillon (Benedictine historian, 1632-1707), refers to a cataloguing of Relics, in the Abbey of S. Riquier, near Abbeville, in 803: "De ligno Domini de veste ejus, de sandaliis ejus, de præsepe ejus, de spongia ejus, de Jordane ubi baptizatus est, de petra ubi sedet quando quinque millia hominum pavit, de pane unde distribuit discipulis ejus, de templo Domini, *de candela quæ in nativitate ejus accensa est*, de monte Horeb, *de lignis trium tabernaculorum;* de lacte Sanctæ Mariæ, de capillis ejus, de veste ejus, de pallio ejus, *de barba Sancti Petri*, de sandaliis ejus, de casula ejus, de mensa ejus; de mensa Sancti Pauli, de orario ejus, de cippo in quo missus fuit" (see Robertson's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. III., Book IV., Chap. IX.).

Should any of these "Relics" be still in existence, such as "the candle, which was lighted at our Lord's birth, pieces of wood from the three tabernacles, the beard of S. Peter," then they should be venerated!

In "The Stations of the Cross," is one representing S. Veronica and her handkerchief, upon which is imprinted the Face of our Lord "la Sainte Face."

The legend, the "tradition," is, that as our Lord was treading "the Way of Sorrows," the Via Dolorosa, S. Veronica having wiped the mingled sweat and blood from His Face, there came fixed upon the handkerchief the Impression, the Likeness, of our Lord's Countenance. The truth is, that the words, "vera Icon" (*i.e.*, true Image), were given to the Picture of our Lord, or, as we have been told, in early Sacred Schools of painting, the painting master used to write, "vera Icon," on the work of a pupil who produced a painting most consonant with his idea of what our Lord may have been like.* An idea was held that she was Bernice (Berenike), niece of Herod, daughter of his sister Salome. There never was a S. Veronica, certainly not this one. This is an example of the many lying legends which please the ignorant of the Roman Communion, and which no care is taken to treat honestly. We think the "Stations" excellent books, but let this chapter be vigorously excluded.

The linen which was folded around our Lord's Head, or His winding-sheet, at His entombment are, or were, to be seen at (1) Aix-la-Chapelle, (2) in the Church at S. Corneille, in Compiègne, (3) at Nice, (4) Trêves, (5) Besançon, (6) Cadouen, in Perigord, (7) in Lorraine, (8) at Rome. Also portions at San Salvador, in Spain, in the Augustinian Convent at Albi.

It seems that the exhibition of the winding-sheet (*"suaire"*) at Livré, near Troyes, was more than once forbidden, *e.g.*, by Henry of Poitiers, Bishop of Troyes; after

* Matthew of Paris (1216), refers to a Likeness of Christ, called "Veronica," which seems to bear out the idea of "true Image" (?).

this prohibition it did not reappear for four and twenty years. About 1378, permission was obtained from the Bishop of Rome to expose this Relic, and it was so ex-exposed, but Peter of Arcis, Bishop of Troyes, forbade the exposition to be continued.

Charles VI. granted permission for an exposition, but the Bishop of Troyes went to Court, and said that the thing was a fraud, and making use of a strong word, for he spoke of "*idolatry*," so the King recalled his permission by an edict, dated August 4th, 1389.

Clement VII. (Giulio de Medici, Pope 1523-1534) granted permission for the "Relic" to be publicly exhibited to the people, in order that it might be venerated. But these Bishops of Troyes seem to have been honest, straightforward prelates, for the then Bishop exposed its imposture; so the Pope at Avignon did not forbid its exposition, but he forbade that it should be exhibited as the real, original winding-sheet. Whether any of the good people who had been venerating this "Relic," or perhaps committing idolatry, whether any of these were annoyed when they found out the true state of the case, history deponeth not. This fraud is now, we believe, in the Cathedral at Turin; a museum, or an ecclesiastical Madame Tussaud's, would seem to be a more suitable place for it.

Other winding-sheets (we ought really to say "*the same winding-sheet*") are or were, is or was, to be found at Rome in S. John Lateran; Santa Maria Maggiore, S. Peter's; also near Lisbon, and at Milan. The napkin covering the Head, besides being at other places, is—or was—to be seen at Cahors ("la sainte coiffe"), at Mayence, at Cleremont in Auvergne, Arles, while fragments helped to sanctify the Sainte Chapelle, Chartres, the Abbey at Montdieu in Champagne.

But all these are to be venerated or adored with latria! The duplication of the "Sainte Face" and of the suaire—upon which are impressions—are explained (?) by the assertion that, when folded, every fold received the impression of the original picture; an unending supply might thus be provided, for miracles still occur!

Of our Lord's "Holy Coat," that for which His executioners cast lots, "without seam, woven from the top throughout" (S. John xix. 23). This appears in two places—*perhaps;* not having seen the garment preserved in France, we have been unable to compare it with that exhibited at Treves (Fr.), Trier (Germ.).

The writer went to Treves to see the "Holy Coat" when exposed to view in the year 1891. He was much struck with the reverence of the processions in that ancient Cathedral. All arrangements were orderly carried out, there was no pestering people for money;* he could but regret that the devotional feelings of the pilgrims were not enlisted in some more worthy cause. Conversing with some Belgium Ultramontanes a few days later, he suggested doubts as to the authenticity of the Relic. It was replied: "But it is not an Article of Faith that this is actually a garment worn by Christ." We suppose not, but in that case the position is something like this. "We do not say you are bound to believe that this is a true Relic of our Lord, but having the title of 'Relic' authorized by the Pope"—and, we suppose, guaranteed—"you are bound by the Council of Trent to reverence it"; and if the statements of some writers of the Roman Communion be correct, you must worship it with latria, because it has come into contact with our Lord's Sacred Person.

* But it was a shock to see the Holy Coat represented on *spittoons* and *tobacco-pouches!*

But of S. John the Baptist there is a great collection of "Relics," all certainly genuine, and all to be venerated! Portions of arm or hands in Holland, formerly at Rhodes, at S. Jean-des-Vignes, at Soissons, S. Maria Maggiore in Rome; at Perpignan, an entire arm with flesh, skin, bones. But a hand of his is to be found at Citeaux, Venice, and Sienna; all these hands are of course authentic, genuine. S. John Baptist possessed an extraordinary hand, for a finger is, or was, possessed in the following places—Besançon, Toulouse, Lyons, Bourges, Florence, S. Jean-des-Aventures, near Macon; also at the Abbey of Basse Fontaine in Champagne, at Malta, at S. Jean-du-doigt ("S. John-of-the-Finger"), in Brittany, and in the Escorial.

These are detached from the arms—or arm—and are all the *index* or *forefinger* of the right hand, that is, the one with which the Baptist pointed out to his disciples our Blessed Lord, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God" (S. John i. 29). There are likewise Relics of S. John the Baptist preserved in the East.

There are several heads—or, rather, the same head—in various places; in the Cathedral at Amiens since the thirteenth century, brought from Constantinople, although (we believe) certain Eastern monks still claim to possess it.

It was when he had seen and kissed this head at Amiens that the Abbe Marolles remarked, "Thanks be to God, this is the sixth head it has been my privilege to salute" (see Ducange, "Dissertation sur le chef de S. Jean").

Baronius tells us that the nuns of Sainte Claire claimed to possess this head, which they had preserved from the insults of certain soldiery.

This same head—that is to say, the same head as the six referred to by the Abbe Marolles, etc.—formerly cherished

at the Sainte Chapelle, was destroyed in the great French Revolution: it has not yet been recovered.

The entire ashes are, or formerly were, contained in the following Churches: S. John Lateran, Church of S. Laurence in Genoa, at Vienne, Puy-en-Velay, at Ardres, in the Abbey of the Paraclete in the Diocese of Amiens, and, we think, at Douai.

A leg of the same at the Church of S. John at Abbeville, another at Venver, another at Toledo, some leg bones at S. John's Priory, Nemours, in the Diocese of Chartres. Also five arms: Boulogne; one sent from Rhodes, which is in Holland; at S. Jean-des-Vignes; at Rome, in S. Maria Maggiore; a fifth, with skin, flesh, and nails, in a Church at Perpignan.

S. Peter Martyr, or "Peter the Preacher," murdered in the thirteenth century, must have been possessed of about thirty fingers, if all his "Relics" be truly what they are called.

Frederick III., "the Wise," Elector and Duke of Saxony (1463-1525), at enormous cost, brought together 1,010 sacred Relics into his new Chapel at Wittenberg, a mere look at which procured Indulgence for one hundred years.

In a catalogue of Relics, contained in the Churches of S. Maurice and S. Mary, at Hallé—which catalogue was published in A.D. 1520—are mentioned, a piece of earth from a field of Damascus, of which God made the first man; a piece of a field at Hebron, where Adam repented; a piece of the body of Isaac, twenty-five fragments of the burning bush of Horeb, seen by Moses (about B.C. 1530); specimens of the Manna, the finger of S. John the Baptist, with which he pointed to our Lord; the finger of Thomas, that touched our Lord's side (S. John xx. 27); a bit of the Altar at

which S. John read Mass for the Blessed Virgin; the stone which killed S. Stephen, a great piece of S. Paul's skull, etc., etc., etc.

The collection consisted of over eight thousand "Relics," and could have afforded Indulgences for 39,245,100 years.

But we come nearer home, and may be edified by a catalogue of "Relics," which formerly belonged to the Abbey of Glastonbury: "A portion of the sepulchre of Rachel, some of the Manna given in the wilderness, a small bone, which had belonged to the body of one of the three whom Nebuchadnezzar cast into the fiery furnace; six stones from the Temple at Jerusalem, three pieces of our Lord's Manger, some of the gold presented by the Magi, one of the water pots filled at the Marriage at Cana; two of the stones which the Devil bade our Lord change into bread, a piece of the bread from one of the loaves which our Lord multiplied; some of the earth upon which the Blessed Virgin wept when our Saviour's side was pierced . . . some of the hairs, from the raiment of camel's hair, worn by S. John the Baptist; two of S. Peter's teeth" ("Johannis Confratris et Monacchi Glastoniensis Chronica").

To suppose that Relics were not discredited or jeered at before the Reformation shows an ignorance of opinion held by Englishmen in the time of Chaucer, who died in 1400, at the age of 72. In "The Pardoner's Tale" we have this pardon-monger commencing his remarks with the remark that "Radix malorum est cupiditas."

"Then show I forth my longe cristal stones
Ycrammed ful of cloutes and of bones,
Relikes they ben, as wenen they echon.
Then have I in laton a shulder bone,
Which that was of an holy Jewe's shepe.
Good men, say I, take of my wordes kepe:

If that this bone be washe in any well,
If cow, or calf, or shepe, or oxe swell,
That any worm hath ete, or worm ys tongue,
And it is whole anon," etc., etc.

The pardon-monger possessed a wondrous mitten.

"He that his hand wol put in this mitaine,
He shall have multiplying of his graine,
Whan he hath sowen, be it whete or otes,
So that he offers pens, or elles grotes. . . .

I preche of nothing but for covetise.
Therefore my teme is yet, and ever was,
Radix malorum est cupiditas.

Thus can I preche again the same vice
Which that I use, and that is avarice," etc.

The sarcasm levelled by Chaucer against people professing to sell holy Relics must have been but an exposition, an echo, of opinions held by royalty, the Court, and the great of the land. For Chaucer himself dwelt at Court under Edward III.; he would not have ventured to treat such things in this manner had not the King and his Court scoffed at them.

No wonder our Reformers wrote as they did, and what they did, against Relics, but one may feel struck by the gentle manner, void of bitterness or exaggerations, in which they phrased the Article of Religion.

Dean Milman wrote: "The fondness for cherishing memorials of the beloved, in human affection so excusable and amiable"; this sentiment caused genuine Relics to be preserved in the beginning, but pious motives mingled with superstitious fancies, which at length became fraudulent motives, producing many legions of so-called "Relics," many being but multiples of one and the same Relic; indeed, it became considered hardly an immoral action to

steal much-valued Relics from their legitimate owners, as did Eginhard, when he stole those of S. Benedict and carried them into Italy.

But excuses for the appearance of the same Relic in various places at one and the same time may sometimes be made on this score, that what is commonly called a whole limb is in reality but a part of that limb, or the "Crown of Thorns" may be in reality but one or two thorns; but there are so many cases where a whole limb, or a whole head, appears in more than one place at the same time.

But Cardinal Newman—in his "Lectures on the Position of Catholics in England" (1851)—maintains that, although some Relics *must* be spurious, and many are actually so, still some may be accepted as genuine, and that the danger of making mistakes in detail must not be considered as a valid objection to a pious custom.

A Jesuit of Annecy, by name Jean Ferrand, wrote a portly tome on the subject of Relics, and therein explained the peculiar power possessed by so many Relics of being multiplied. "If," said he, "we find in several Churches the head of one and the same person, or the body of one and the same Saint, it was Providence who has produced the miraculous multiplication, in order to sustain and increase the devotion of the faithful" ("Unum mihi sat erit dicere supremum numen suam procul dubio explicuisse potentiam in iis nominatim reliquiis multiplicandis").

This is indeed an evolution of matter and quantity!

If the "devotion of the faithful" cannot be sustained and increased by the Ministry of the Word, by the administration of the Holy Sacraments, combined with a practical association of the Priesthood with the daily life of their

fellow-citizens, if this devotion cannot be advanced without obvious deceit, such as we have referred to, then we cannot be surprised at the fact that millions of men, in countries under Roman rule, believe in no being but themselves, in nothing but their own sincerity of belief, in nothing invisible or above nature.

The Council of Trent said, that "no new Relics were to be received, without the permission of the Bishop!"

Now, either all the "Relics" we have mentioned, were (1) old and genuine, or (2) new and approved of by Bishops, and quite genuine, or (3) false; and there is no safeguard from any innumerable frauds and impositions, because many Relics, certainly false, have been approved by Bishops, or (4) many Relics are shown which are unauthorized.

Dens, the well-known Roman writer, asks the following question, and gives the answer:—

"With what worship are Relics honoured?

"In a mode and with a worship like that with which the Images of Christ and the Saints are worshipped (according to what was said, Numbers xxvii.), and thus, *with the same worship with which the person whose Relics they are*, but a relative or respective worship . . . Objection. A pious son does not honour the instruments of contumely with which his father was slain; therefore a Christian ought not to worship *the Cross, or the other instruments* of the death of Christ, or of the Martyrs. . . . I deny it. . . . We worship *the Cross, etc.* . . . inasmuch as they were the instruments of the victorious Passion and exaltation, which were also sanctified by *the contact* of the Body of Christ, or of the Saints."

From which it would appear, that if the Blessed Virgin is to be worshipped with *hyperdoulia*—as some teach—all

Relics of her, as for instance, a hair, a veil—are to be worshipped with *hyperdoulia*, or with *latria*, as others inculcate.

Of course such an idea would be rejected, but ignorant people may believe it, because of Romish wording and super-subtleties.

An interesting article in "The Church Quarterly," for July, 1881, quotes the wording of Father Ryder, when that Roman clergyman apologizes for the absolutely false pretention of Relics, "in certain localities": "That there are, and always have been, false and doubtful Relics, is nothing to the point. This must have been inevitable in any case; but granting the existence of any degree of carelessness at certain times, and in certain localities, the authorities of the Church might well hesitate to undertake an antiquarian investigation, of almost hopeless arduousness, to the great disturbance of much traditional local piety. The doubtful Relic, even if granting its falsity, is still, as an Image, capable of transmitting the cultus of the Saint to its object."

For example: the alleged tooth of an Apostle or Saint may in reality be that of some animal low down in creation. In one of the Southern Cathedrals of France a Relic had long been revered as a tooth of S. Christopher ("Christ-bearer"), a mighty giant, who is said to have carried our Lord, in the guise of a Child, through a swollen river.

While the "Relic" was indeed a tooth, it was that of the antediluvian monster known as the Dinosaur!

And we are to infer that the tooth of this terrible lizard is capable of transmitting the cultus of the Saint to its object!

The clergy and people must not be blamed for their excusable error in natural history and geology, but when

the mistake became manifest was the tooth quietly withdrawn? We expect not. Is not the "Sacro Catino" in Genoa—the Cup which the Saviour passed round to the Apostles (S. Mark xiv. 23), and said to be made out of a single emerald—has this been withdrawn from worshipful gaze of the faithful, or has the error been acknowledged?

With respect to Relics of this quality—and they are numerous—the people must not have the truth told them because "local piety" has been linked for so long to a "traditional" Relic; this tooth is to be worshipped with doulia, the Apostle honoured, and likewise gratified. Instead of these people being honestly dealt with, their religious feeling directed in a better path—say to some real and authenticated Relic—their religious superiors allow the misplaced confidence to continue; until one fine day a naturalist finds out the nature of the so-called Relic, people learn the fact, the neighbouring clergy express surprise when they hear remarks of atheistic character, "traditional local piety" dwindles, and finally disappears.

We need not be afraid of having material Images within our Churches, but we may reasonably dread those immaterial Images which Protestantism rears to its own fancy, and for its own narrow-minded delectation. For the Latin word for Image *(Imago)* has, among other meanings, those of "*fallacy of vision*" and "*reverberation of a sound*," and ignorant popular clamour, aroused by an unsuccessful politician, or a peripatetic brawler, has not lost its perennially vicious power. Such still cling fast to the discredited Relics of a period, when aliens interfered with us and our affairs, or when the Church was nearly exanimate, while her dignitaries and "the first gentleman in Europe" lived, and grew fat together.

A NOTE, FINAL, EXTRANEOUS, AND SUGGESTIVE.

Owing to the nature of the case, we have often found fault with certain doctrines and practices in the Church of Rome. Nevertheless, we would fain point out a very important matter, in the treatment of which she sets us an example; she still makes the *Eucharistic Service the chief* of all Services, as do the conservative, anti-papal Churches of the East.

Just as the fact of England being an island has caused her to remain uninfluenced by many customs and ideas observed and followed abroad, so this geographical semi-isolation has thrown her back upon herself; and this applies not only to the State but likewise to the Church.

Owing to peculiar characteristics and their results—which the foreigner tries to account for and explain — our shortcomings are frequently our own peculiar property.

Certain it is, that we alone of the whole Catholic Church have, by a modern custom—not by ecclesiastical command, but rather by a clerical and laical neglect—placed a reformed *monkish Office* into that prominence which should be the property and position of our *Blessed Lord's Own appointed Service*; we produce Matins as a glorified function, with sermon; when there is a possibility of some people feeling tired, *then* the Service of Holy Communion follows, relegated to an inferior position, perhaps the choir has retired, or will retire, after the Church Militant Prayer, certainly with an inferiority of numbers attending; as though the special Presence were during the former instead of, as it is, during the latter Service.

We accuse the Roman Church of having practically deified the Blessed Virgin, of having made her, in a sense, superior to our Saviour, because certain authorities say she can command her Son, and that He *must* obey.

Are *we* not guilty of the same kind of sin? Have *we* not raised men above the Son of God, have *we* not placed Morning Prayer, a Service of monkish men's invention, in a position of superiority to *the* Service in which are repeated the identical words spoken by Him at the Institution thereof? We are acting against primitive principles, and contrary to universal custom.

Let a foreigner, unaccustomed to our customs and tongue, see the crowds at a Choral Matins, then let him notice the majority of people trooping out, then a Service in which few, or comparatively few, are present, with little music, or with none. Then ask him which, in his opinion, must be the Service of the higher authority, the more honoured. The reply would be, that the former was the chief and the more noble, therefore the more honoured. The Great Service, the "Breaking of the Bread," the "Holy Communion," the "Eucharist," the "Service of the Holy Mysteries," *this* is the Chief Service, not monkish offices, and preachments; but we act as if the contrary were the case.

And people wonder at our "unhappy divisions"! The wonder lies in this, that they can and do wonder.

Corrigenda.

pp. 30, 31. *For* "Turning further . . . both quick and dead" *read*
"Turning further to Anglican divines of the most striking phase of the Reformation Period, we find Archbishop *Cranmer* ordering, or advising, such prayers of the nature now under consideration.

"In March, 1537, appeared 'The Institution of a Christen Man.' In the last Article, 'Of Purgatorye'—on page 97 of the original edition—appear the following words (we put them into modern English): 'It standeth with the very due order of charity, that Christian men should pray for the souls departed, and commit them in our prayers to God's mercy,' etc.

"This book is known also as 'The Bishops' Book.'

"At a later date Cranmer presided over a commission comprising all the English Bishops, eight Archdeacons, and seventeen Doctors-in-Divinity: among the first-mentioned was Bishop Hugh Latimer.

"One result of this important meeting was the appearance, in 1543, of 'A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen Man.' In the British Museum is bound up with this a Latin translation, dated 1644, 'Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio.' In the former—and again we use modern English—'Forasmuch as due order of charity requireth, and the Book of the Maccabees and *divers ancient Doctors* plainly show that it is a very good and charitable deed to pray for the souls departed; and forasmuch as *such usage has continued* in the Church so many years, *even from the beginning*, men ought to judge and think the same to be well and profitably done. And truly it standeth with the very order of charity, a Christian man to pray for another, both quick and dead . . . as well in masses and exequies. . . . And here is specially to be noted, that it is not in the power or knowledge of any man to limit and dispense how much and in what space of time, or to what person particularly, the said masses, exequies, and suffrages, do profit and

avail. . . . Furthermore, because the place where the souls remain, the name thereof, the state and condition which they be in, be to us uncertain, therefore these, with all other such things, must also be left to Almighty God, unto whose mercy it is meet and convenient for us to commend . . .' (From 'Of Prayer for Souls Departed,' pp. 92, 93, in original edition). This book of 1543 is commonly known as 'The King's Book.'"

p. 39. *For* "Serjeat" *read* "Serjeant" ("S. W.").

p. 58. *For* "ἐξομολήσασθαι" *read* "ἐξομολογήσασθαι."

p. 119. *For* "But a great change . . . nature of Purgatory" *read* "But a great change was to come over the views entertained about Purgatory, and a remarkable revolution—partial, if you will—concerning its nature was to be brought about, due largely to the mind of a woman."

p. 174. *For* "Reeikins" *read* "Reinkens."

p. 189. *Before* "actual birth" *supply* "an."

p. 189. *For* "she whose Son is Himself God, that is, of whom was born that Body" *read* "she of whom He was then humanly born may truly be described as 'one whose Son is Himself God,' that is, of whom was born that Body . . ."

p. 197. Omit quotation-marks *before* "In these latter days" and *after* "to minister."

p. 199. Omit quotation-marks *before* "To ask."

p. 200. Insert quotation-marks *before* "To invoke."

p. 206. *For* "Altaire" *read* "Altare."

p. 229. *For* "des" *read* "dès."

p. 236. *For* "priè," "exaucè" *read* "prié," "exaucé."

p. 265. *For* "depreciating" *read* "deprecating."

p. 280. *For* "Isorian" *it would be better to read* "Isaurian."

p. 332. *For* "S. Peter Neri" *read* "S. Philip Neri."

p. 335. *After* "and examine" *and before* "the painting" *supply the words* "triptychs in Munich, Nuremburg, etc.; or others who have studied."

p. 337. *Before* "central Cross" *supply* "single and."

p. 343. *For* "Jesuit" *read* "jesuit."

p. 360. *For* "reduplication" *read* "reduplications."

Addenda.

Excerpta (23) and p. 282. Leo II., writing to the Emperor, "confirmed the doctrine of the *Sixth* Synod; he calls it repeatedly, 'Sancta et universalis et magna sexta Synodus, sancta et magna synodus, sanctum sextum concilium. . . . Anathematizamus . . . *Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem maculari permisit,** et omnes qui in suo errore defuncti sunt'" (Hefele's "Councils," Vol. V., p. 189).

See also page 185 in the same volume of Hefele: which, on page 186, informs the reader that the Council of "*In Trullis*" says in its first canon: "Further, we confess the faith which the Sixth Synod proclaimed. That taught that we must accept two natural wills and operations in Christ, and condemned (καταδικάσασα) all who taught only one will . . . *Honorius of Rome,*" etc.

The "*Seventh* Œcumenical" affirmed: "We declare . . . condemning (ἀποκηρύξασα) Sergius, *Honorius* of Rome," etc.

The "*Eighth* Œcumenical": "Sanctam et universalem sextam synodum suscipientes . . . anathematizamus . . . *Honorium Romæ.*"

Excerpta (26). To be more definite we add that the Easterns reject "Filioque," considering these words to be, what in reality they are, an illegal interpolation inserted by the Provincial Synod of Toledo (A.D. 589). It has been shown that, practically, there is no divergence of fundamental truth and doctrine, and that the divergence lies in words and not in meaning. The essence of the signification is seen in a treatise written by Archbishop Cyril, President of the Ephesian Council: "The Holy Ghost . . . is shed forth, comes forth, as from a fountain, from God the Father, *but is supplied to the creature through the Son.*"

*The Greek was παρεχώρησε.

p. 188. *After* Χριστοτόκος *add* :—The Nestorians, by change of a single accent, calling the Blessed Virgin "Theótokos" (proparoxyton), that is, born from God like all other creatures, did not believe her to be "Theotókos" (paroxyton), Mother of the Son of God.

(Let us be careful in this matter of the accent: the compiler acknowledges that, in speaking, he has always put the accent on the former "o"; also, that the above remark from the "Catechism of Bulgaris" is a revelation to him.)

In a note to "Bulgaris" (p. 91) we read also: "And for the title Theotokos, we observe that in the Liturgy of the Lord's Brother it occurs always in the genitive case, and hence perhaps the man-worshipper Nestorius took occasion to blaspheme, saying that the Virgin Mary ought not to be called Mother of God (Θεοτόκος), but child of God (Θεότοκος), or born of God spiritually; because Θεοτόκος and Θεότοκος have the same genitive" (see also p. 214 of "Bulgaris").

p. 215. Since quoting Mr. Birkbeck we have had the "Catechism of Bulgaris" lent us. On pp. 180, 181, of this work we find: "Honourable adoration is what the holy inspired Fathers call what is generally termed *Douleia*, which belongs to Images and the Saints, and was so named since it is offered to the Saints as servants and ministers of God. . . . To the All-holy Virgin neither Latreia nor Douleia is suitable, but the honour and adoration of *Hyperdouleia* . . . the reverence of Hyperdouleia itself is due to her, the adoration of Hyperdouleia."

pp. 282, line 22, and 293-4:—"Because the honour shown to them is referred to the prototypes which they represent," etc. These words of the Tridentine Council are taken from the wording of the Second Nicene Council, which has "The honour done to an Image passes to the original," etc.

p. 287. This "Louis the Pious" is better known as "Louis le Débonnaire," but we have taken the title as we found it. He must not be confused with the son of Louis VI., which son was known as "Le Pieux," "Le Jeune": d. 1180.

To Note on p. 318 *add*:—The Altar is often called "ἅγια τράπεζα," sometimes "τράπεζα Κυρίου," even "ἡ τράπεζα"—"the table"—only. What the Greek Catholics understand by "the Holy Table" may be seen on pages 48-9, 85-6, of "The Holy Catechism of Nicholas Bulgaris" (in English, published by Masters, 1893). It is to be regretted that our clergy do not study Eastern Churches affairs as much, or nearly so, as they do those of the

Latin Church. From this Catechism we quote but nine lines: "The Holy Table is the most excellent part of the Church, and therefore stands in the midst of the Holy Bema, where is the Altar or Propitiatory, the very Holy of Holies. . . . Also it is the Cherubic Throne of the Great King, on which the God of Heaven, Who rideth on the cherubim, rested in bodily form. So says S. Germanus in his Mystic View. And for this reason the Holy Gospel, which always stands upon the Holy Table, exhibits *Christ* sitting like a King on His throne."

(Some among us prefer the *Alms-dish*, or "*decent bason*," to the Volume of the Holy Gospel, or of the Altar Book.)

Our own Bishop Overall wrote: "The word 'Table' stands not exclusively, as if it might not be called an 'Altar,' but to show the indifferency and liberty of the name; as of old it was called *mensa Domini*, the Table of the Lord: the one having reference to the participation, the other to the oblation of the Eucharist."

(See also Mant's Prayer Book, 1820.)

THE END.

Printed by Curtis & Beamish, Ltd., Coventry.

Jesse, E.T.
Prayers for the Departed
236.5P
J495
C.2
105657
JUL 26 71

236.5P
J495
C.2
105657